/	1 2	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
	3	IN re: Docket #AO-F&V-991-A3 FV03-991-01
	4	HOPS PRODUCERS FOR WASHINGTON, OREGON, IDAHO AND
	5	CALIFORNIA
	6	
	7	Hearing held on the 17th day of October, 2003
	8	at 8:39 a.m.
	9	Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
	10	8235 NE Airport Way
	i 1	Portland, OR 97220
	12	
_	13 14	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RECEIVED BEFORE: JILL S. CLIFTON
	15	
	16	BEFORE: JILL S. CLIFTON
	17	BEFORE: JILL S. CLIFTON BEFORE: JILL S. CLIFTON
	18 19 20	

1	INDEX		
2			Page
3	Thomas W. Gasseling		538
4	Donald M. Kloth		649
5	Rod Christensen		680
6	John F. Annen		737
7	Peter M. Vandeneynde		771
8	Andrew C. Kerr		780
9	Paul W. Fobert		799
10	Jeff J. Butsch		806
11	Leslie A. Roy		815
12			
13	INDEX TO EXHIBITS		
14		MARKED	ADMITTED
15	#22 Donald W. Kloth Statement	649	7 78
16	#23 Henry von Eichel Statement	770	775
17	#24 John F. Annen Statement	776	798
18	#25 Andrew Kerr Statement	779	823
19			

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	October 17, 2003
3	
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're on record
5	again. It's 8:39 in the morning. This is Friday, 17,
6	October, 2003. This is day three of our Hops rule
7	making hearing. This will be volume three of the
8	transcript. The case caption is in re: Hops Produced
9	in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California. The
10	docket number is AO-F&V-991-A3 FVO3 that's 03-991-01.
11	. I've asked the court reporting service, York,
12	through the court reporter to have the same typist
13	prepare all these three days of transcript so that I
14	think it will insure a better-quality transcript.
15	The contract was for a turnaround time of 15
16	days, but because I've not allowed the court reporter to
17	send any tapes yet and because I'm asking that the same
18	typist prepare all three volumes, that time will be
19	extended so that York will have a reasonable time to
20	complete the typing of this first three days.
21	Those three days, of course, will be added to
22	next week's five days before we actually have the
23	document that will show all of the testimony.
24	I'd like to start with preliminary matters
25	that anyone might like to raise at this time about
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

l	scheduling and the like. Mr. Carswell.
2	MR. CARSWELL: Yes, Your Honor. I have
3	discussed this with other counsel here this morning and
4	have gotten their gracious cooperation, but I was
5	wondering if possible if and it may not be but wanted
6	to see if it was possible if we could end a couple hours
7	early today at three o'clock for scheduling reasons to
8	get back to St. Louis for an obligation that I have this
9	weekend. And if not, then, you know, we'll just go on
10	to 5:00, but just wanted to check.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: My main concern is
12	that we finish by the end of next week. We certainly
13	may be able to move more quickly than we have this week,
14	because so much of what we did was just getting started.
15	We can expect, though, when we start in Yakima ought to
16	have some of the same logistics and hearing system
17	adjustments to be made.
18	But let me ask now what the position of
19	Proponent's group would be on our stopping the hearing
20	at 3:00 today.
21	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, we have no objection
22	to accommodating the schedule of all counsel. Three
23	o'clock, I think, should be sufficient. I do believe we
24	have sufficient time next week to address all the
25	issues, especially now that the Red Sox are not going to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	the World Series, we can work late into the night every
2	night next week.
3	I also believe, Your Honor, that we have made
4	some adjustments to the Proponent's presentation this
5	morning that I think are going to be able to streamline
6	the presentation. I think we will make a fair amount
7	more headway than in the last couple of days.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
9	you, Mr. Monahan. Ms. Deskins.
10	MS. DESKINS: We have no objection.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Is
12	there anyone else that would like to be heard on the
13	issue?
14	All right. Mr. Carswell, we'll stop at 3:00
15	today.
16	MR. CARSWELL: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I would,
18	nevertheless, like to take a lunch break. I don't think
19	we want to work straight through, so at the appropriate
20	time I would like to break for lunch.
21	All right. Any other preliminary matters?
22	All right. It appears not. I don't have your
23	exact time calculated, so I'm not going to give you that
24	until we get to Yakima, but then I'll give you a summary
25	of how the time was utilized this week.
	Varis Stangaranhia Sarriaga Ing

1	All right. Mr. Monahan.
2	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. This
3	actually may qualify as the last of the preliminary
4	matters, but it also segues into the presentation this
5	morning. In response to a number of the questions that
6	were raised yesterday by the Department and Mr. Moody,
7	we are going to call as the first witness this morning
8	Mr. Tom Gasseling. Mr. Gasseling is going to offer some
9	remarks regarding the definitions that were discussed
10	yesterday, as well as a couple of the provisions on the
11	administrative committee provisions.
12	In addition, there were some questions raised
13	as to whether perhaps particular verbiage might have
14	been better stated to effectively address the intent of
15	the Proponent's Committee, and to that end Mr. Gasseling
16	will be proposing some minor verbiage changes to more
17	accurately reflect the intent of the committee.
18	After Mr. Gasseling, and this is going to
19	constitute a change to our original presentation that we
20	handed around to everyone, I'll defer to Your Honor if
21	perhaps we should make this an exhibit, because I keep
22	referring to it, but the fact that it's being changed
23	may dissuade us from that course.
24	In any event, the next witness who would have

appeared on the schedule would have been Reggie

25

1	Brulotte, discussing expenses and assessments, Sections
2	991.30 and 991.31. Ms. Brulotte was going to reappear
3	again and talk about reports and records, 991.60,
4	991.63. Then Duane Desserault was going to talk about
5	the miscellaneous provisions at Sections 991.70 through
6	991.94.
7	The collective judgment of the administrative
8	or excuse me, of the Proponent's Committee is that
9	these are the nuts and bolts, procedural mechanisms
10	involved in the order, and that the author of those
11	provisions, Mr. Rod Christensen, who is with us today,
12	might be perhaps the best witness to answer questions
13	about those provisions and to present testimony about
14	what they were intended to accomplish and how they are
15	intended to operate.
16	So to that end after Mr. Gasseling we will
17	call Mr. Rod Christensen. He will substitute for those
18	provisions that I just mentioned.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: The spelling of Mr.
20	Christensen's last name, please.
21	MR. MONAHAN: I'll need some help here.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Could
23	you come to the podium there and turn on that microphone
24	for us? All right. Thank you.
25	MR. CHRISTENSEN: My name is Rod Christensen.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
That's R-o-d, second name, C-h-r-i-s-t-e-n-s-e-n.
1
                 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. And
2
       would you identify yourself by how you have participated
3
4
       with the Proponent's Committee?
5
                 MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. I am a consultant.
6
       have a small consulting firm in Kennewick, Washington.
       The Proponent's Committee hired me approximately 18
7
8
       months ago to help draft the language of the order.
                 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Good.
9
       Thank you so much.
10
                 Thank you, Mr. Monahan. You may continue.
11
                 MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. That's
12
       the last of the preliminary matters, and we would call
13
14
       Mr. Tom Gasseling to the stand.
                 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
15
       you. Mr. Gasseling, do you want to get some water
16
17
       before you start?
18
                 MR. GASSELING: That might be a good idea.
                 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. Mr.
19
       Gasseling, would you again state your full name and
20
       spell your names?
21
22
                  MR. GASSELING: My name is Thomas W.
23
        Gasseling, T-h-o-m-a-s, W., Gasseling,
        G-a-s-s-e-l-i-n-g.
24
25
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I believe you were
```

1	sworn in yesterday. Is that correct?
2	MR. GASSELING: Yes, I was.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. You
4	remain sworn. You may proceed.
5	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, we are going to
6	deviate a little bit from prior proceedings, and we are
7	I'm going to conduct a limited direct examination of
8	Mr. Gasseling.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
10	* * *
11	THOMAS W. GASSELING,
12	having previously been duly sworn, according to the law,
13	testified as follows:
14	BY MR. MONAHAN:
15	Q. Mr. Gasseling, could you please tell us
16	who you are and what you do?
17	A. Well, my name is Tom Gasseling. We have
18	a farm in Wapato, Washington, and we raise hops and
19	other crops.
20	Q. How long have you been doing that?
21	A. We are fourth or fifth generation farmers
22	in the valley.
23	Q. Do you have any personal knowledge or
24	familiarity with prior orders, Mr. Gasseling?
25	A. Yes, I do.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Q. Can you describe that, please?
2	A. During the prior Hop Marketing Order I
3	was employed by John I. Haas Incorporated, a dealer,
4	major dealer, and I was an alternate on the hop or
5	excuse me, the HAB, which was the Handler Advisory Board
6	for the prior marketing order.
7	Q. Did you play any role on the Proponent's
8	Committee in the development of the Hop Marketing Order
9	that is being currently proposed, Mr. Gasseling?
10	A. Yes, I did.
11	Q. Could you describe your role?
12	A. I was asked to serve on the committee to
13	help develop the language for a proposed marketing order
14	and to get information from the industry as part of that
15	committee to put together a proposal that was hopefully
16	to be acceptable to the majority of the industry.
17	Q. Please describe your efforts and the
18	efforts of the other members of the committee in
19	obtaining that information from the rest of the
20	industry, sir.
21	A. Well, as I think Steve Carpenter's
22	testimony alluded to, originally there was a committee
23	to explore what we could do to help alleviate the
24	oversupply, and from that there was a Proponent's
25	Committee formed, of which I was one of the members. York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	That committee was made up of large, small, medium-sized
2	growers from different areas. We had a number of
3	meetings in all of the states to discuss the original
4	proposal as we originally started to develop it, and I
5	can tell you that it's considerably different today than
6	it was when we first started. But through input of the
7	grower community, and I think I need to emphasize that
8	this document is not a document strictly put together by
9	the Proponent's Committee. It was put together with
10	input from the total industry. Opponents, proponents,
11	people that consider themselves neutral, all of these
12	areas were discussed, and ultimately this is the
13	document that was put forth.
14	Q. Thank you, sir. I'd now like you to
15	direct your attention to the definitions' portion of the
16	proposed order, specifically Sections 991.01 through
17	991.13.
18	***
19	MR. MOODY: Excuse me, Brendan, I don't mean
20	to interrupt. He was referring to this document. I
21	just want, so I can follow it in the record later, what
22	exhibit or what document he's referring to. Did he mean
23	the Federal Register Notice? Is that what he's
24	referring to?
25	MR. GASSELING: Yes. The proposed Federal
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

l .		
	1	Marketing Order.
	2	MR. MOODY: Great. Okay. Thank you, Mr.
	3	Gasseling.
	4	***
	5	BY MR. MONAHAN:
	6	Q. Sir, has the since yesterday's
	7	exchanges regarding specific verbiage within the
	8	definitions themselves, has the committee had the
	9	opportunity to revisit and reconsider certain word
	10	usages?
	11	A. Yes, we have.
	12	Q. Does the committee have any proposed
	13	changes?
	14	A. Yes, we do.
	15	Q. Could you please describe those for those
	16	assembled?
	17	A. Well, first of all, I would like to
	18	explain that when we put this document together we
	19	utilized portions of the old Hop Marketing Order and
	20	portions of the Mint Marketing Order, which is a
	21	functioning order that has stood the test of time, so
	22	there are some things in here that don't contradict, but
	23	they use different terms, which mean the same. So
	24	that's what we're going to try to clear up at this
	25	point.
		York Stenographic Services, Inc.

	1	First of all, do you want me just to go through the
	2	start with the top?
	3	Q. Mr. Gasseling, what I'd like you to do
	4	first is rather than talk about some of the particular
	5	definitions and how they operate, which is what we'll
	6	get into in a moment, I'd like you to first
	7	A. Just the changes in verbiage.
	8	Q. Exactly.
	9	A. Okay. In 991.04 there was the question
	10	where it talks about grown and harvested in the United
	11	States. That should be changed to the production area.
	12	I think all I already addressed item B under that
	13	section, that is an informational statement only, for
	14	informational purposes. It's not intended to be
	15	involved in any other aspects of the order.
	16	In 991.05 we should state production area means rather
	17	than all, it should be the following states with
	18	commercial production.
	19	And then we go up or to 991.08, Section A, and it's
	20	under the handle designation, but we the word dealer
	21	is in there. Dealer is meant to be synonymous with
	22	handler, but because we define handler, that dealer
	23	should be handler. The word handler.
	24	If we move down to 991.15, B, it states independent
	25	producer. Independent producer means the same thing as
\sim		York Stenographic Services, Inc.
		34 North George St. Vork. DA 17401 (717) 854 0077

1	producer. That language somehow was left in there. In
2	the original order there was a co-op and so there were
3	cooperative members and independent members, but in this
4	case independent producer is the same as producer, so
5	the independent should be eliminated.
6	And I think that's it.
7	Q. Thank you, Mr. Gasseling. I'd like to
8	direct your attention to Section 991.06, the definition
9	of producer, and I'd ask you to read the first sentence
10	of that definition into the record.
11	A. "Producer is synonymous with grower and
12	means any person engaged in a proprietary capacity in
13	the commercial production of hops."
14	Q. Sir, do you know where that language
15	comes from?
16	A. Well, the language, with the exception of
17	the word hops, came from the functioning Far West
18	Spearmint Marketing Order.
19	Q. Did the Mint Marketing Order contain the
20	language that appears after the first sentence?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Tell me what the Proponent's Committee
23	was trying to accomplish by including this definition.
24	A. Excuse me. It did not include that. The
25	multiple legal entities

1	Q. Okay.
2	Awe included that.
3	Q. I'm sorry. Tell me why the hop, the
4	Proponent's Committee, decided to add that additional
5	verbiage.
6	A. Well, in the meetings we had throughout
7	the industry there was considerable concern that
8	representation on the committees and voting committee
9	members would be done in a fashion that the numbers
10	could not be skewed. The basic concept was to have one
11	grower, one vote, and the reason this verbiage was added
12	in there was so that it would eliminate as best we could
13	the possibility where same entities or same groups or
14	same farms could create a number of different grower
15	entities but under the same ownership ultimately, thus
16	having a number of votes, more than they should, which
17	would then have the effect of skewing any voting
18	procedure for representation.
19	Q. Sir, I'm going to imagine you might hear
20	some hypothetical questions in your cross examination
21	today regarding examples of directors or stockholders or
22	officers. Is this definition intended to be exhaustive
23	and comprehensive and to address every possible
24	scenario?

25

A. Well, I think some of the hypotheticals
 York Stenographic Services, Inc.
 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

n in the control of t

1	would biopapily have to be addressed by the hypothetical
2	committee themselves, you know. I it's not intended
3	to cover everything. There's no way you could write a
4	document that would cover every single possibility, but
5	this is the framework for the committee to address
6	specific issues, but the intent, again, is that the
7	growers can feel comfortable that their vote is
8	important and is not being overshadowed by a situation
9	where and I'll give you an example.
10	In the past marketing order, and that's why this is
11	considerably different than the old one, the past
12	marketing order you could have as many entities as you
13	wanted, and they could all have common boards of
14	directors or they could have common ownership or they
15	could have common banking, and you got a vote for each
16	one of those entities. So what would happen is there
17	could be a grower that and I'll talk from experience
18	in the old one, John I. Haas Incorporated had 4,000
19	acres of hops and one entity. They got one vote. There
20	were individuals who had less than 200 acres and had
21	three, four, five, six, seven votes.
22	And, again, when we talked to the industry and talked to
23	people out there, and this was a major concern of the
24	opponent's group that this not be allowed to happen,
25	that the votes would be equal, and they would get equal
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	representation. So that's why that was put in there.
2	Q. You said, sir, the issues of whether a
3	growing operation or a given corporate organization
4	would have one vote or two votes or however many votes
5	would be determined by the committee. You don't mean
6	this committee?
7	A. No, not by this committee. The
8	administrative committee set up after the marketing
9	order would be voted in.
10	Q. Thank you, sir. I'd like you now to
11	direct your attention to Section 991.08.
12	***
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Monahan, let's
14	just make sure we have the spelling in the record of the
15	corporation mentioned a couple of times, the John Haas.
16	MR. GASSELING: The corporation's name is
17	John, J-o-h-n, I., Haas, H-a-a-s, Incorporated.
18	***
19	BY MR. MONAHAN:
20	Q. Turning your attention then to Section
21	991.08, the definition of handle. Could you please tell
22	us where the language appearing under this definition
23	came from?
24	A. It also came from the Mint Marketing
25	Order.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Q. We heard some questions yesterday about
2	whether brewers, for example, would be considered
3	handlers. Can you please offer testimony describing the
4	intent of the committee in coming up with the definition
5	of handler?
6	A. Well, the intent of the committee was to
7	try to discern between a producer and a handler, a
8	person that totally handled hops versus a producer who
9	just produced. In this case here we have a situation
10	where we do have growers that or producers that
11	deliver directly to the end user. And in that case the
12	producer would, in fact, be the handler. And so we were
13	trying to explain what a handler was and what a handler
14	was not, you know. A person delivering his a
15	producer delivering his product to a handler, even
16	though he's transporting it, is not considered a
17	handler. And so there are the exemptions so that we
18	could make sure that everybody understood what that
19	meant.
20	Q. Just for clarification, sir, and I'm not
21	going to ask you to parse sentences, but if there are
22	let's just talk about examples. If a producer sells
23	directly to a brewery, an end user, who is the handler?
24	A. The producer.
25	Q. If a producer delivers product to a
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

understand that term, and I'll ask you to describe it in a moment, who is the handler? A. The dealer. Q. What's a dealer? A. A handler. Q. In today's market and industry how many dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe what they do. A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell	1	consignor, who is the handler?
understand that term, and I'll ask you to describe it in a moment, who is the handler? A. The dealer. Q. What's a dealer? A. A handler. Q. In today's market and industry how many dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe what they do. A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	2	A. The consignor.
A. The dealer. Q. What's a dealer? A. A handler. Q. In today's market and industry how many dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe what they do. A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	3	Q. If the producer sells to a dealer, as you
A. The dealer. Q. What's a dealer? A. A handler. Q. In today's market and industry how many dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe what they do. A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	4	understand that term, and I'll ask you to describe it in
A. A handler. Q. In today's market and industry how many dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe what they do. A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	5	a moment, who is the handler?
A. A handler. Q. In today's market and industry how many dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe what they do. A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	6	A. The dealer.
Q. In today's market and industry how many dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe what they do. A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	7	Q. What's a dealer?
dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe what they do. A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. D. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	8	A. A handler.
A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	9	Q. In today's market and industry how many
A. Well, in my opinion there are actually two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	10	dealers in your opinion are there, and please describe
two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be 14 S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. 15 Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima 16 Chief? 17 A. All I know is that they basically do not 18 buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell 19 them hops. They are an organization that I basically do 20 not have access to, and it's my understanding that 21 Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The 22 acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be 23 considered the handler. And but I don't have access to 24 that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the 25 sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	11	what they do.
S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated. Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	12	A. Well, in my opinion there are actually
Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima Chief? A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	13	two functioning handlers or dealers, and that would be
16 Chief? 17 A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	14	S. S. Stiener and John I. Haas Incorporated.
A. All I know is that they basically do not buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	15	Q. How would you define Hop Union or Yakima
buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	16	Chief?
them hops. They are an organization that I basically do not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	17	A. All I know is that they basically do not
not have access to, and it's my understanding that Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	18	buy hops from the grower. They do not I cannot sell
Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	19	them hops. They are an organization that I basically do
acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	20	not have access to, and it's my understanding that
considered the handler. And but I don't have access to that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	21	Yakima Chief does not take title to the product. The
that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	22	acquire it, so as we defined it here they would be
25 sense that I can sell my product to. York Stenographic Services, Inc.	23	considered the handler. And but I don't have access to
York Stenographic Services, Inc.	24	that, so I don't consider them to be a handler in the
- ·	25	sense that I can sell my product to.
		- ·

1	Q. Let me see if I can break it down. If we
2	exclude all those producers who could eventually be
3	handlers under this definition, exclude those instances
4	in which there are direct sales made to end users, how
5	many handlers exist in the world today under this
6	definition?
7	A. Basically two major handlers. There may
8	be some smaller handlers in Europe, but for our market
9	or my market here in the US there would be two major
10	handlers.
11	Q. You do understand, however, that the
12	consignors, the Yakima Chief, Hop Union, they would meet
13	the definition of handler under 991.08 as well?
14	A. Yes, they would.
15	Q. I'd like you to turn your attention then,
16	sir
17	***
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Just so I'm clear
19	so that there would be a total just of four if you
20	include those two entities as well? There would just be
21	four handlers?
22	MR. GASSELING: Well, you have John I. Haas,
23	you have
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Don't talk to me
25	MR. GASSELING: You have John I. Haas,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

	1	Incorporated, you have S. S. Stiener, you would have
	2	Yakima Chief as a handler because they acquire. They
	3	don't take title, but they acquire, and then you would
	4	have the direct sales made by growers to brewers. They
	5	would be considered handlers.
	6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: The brewers would
	7	be considered
	8	MR. GASSELING: No.
	9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:handlers?
	10	MR. GASSELING: The growers would be
	11	considered handlers.
	12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: The growers would
	13	be considered handlers. Go ahead and follow up, Mr.
	14	Monahan, if there's anything further there for
	15	clarification.
	16	***
	17	BY MR. MONAHAN:
	18	Q. The question was asked I did the math
	19	in my head, and the last time I did add two and two it
	20	was four as well. If we add the two consignors and the
	21	two persons or entities that you say meet the definition
	22	of handlers, excuse me, dealers, I just want to have it
	23	clear for the Department and the people assembled here
	24	today. How many entities, how many organizations really
L	25	are likely to be defined as handlers as entities who
		York Stenographic Services, Inc.
		34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	handle hops under these proposed definitions? Excluding
2	the instance in which a producer sells direct to a
3	brewer.
4	A. Well, there would be John I. Haas, there
5	would be S. S. Stiener, there would be Yakima Chief, and
6	I forgot, because I was talking about major handlers,
7	the other one would be Hop Union.
8	Q. So four.
9	A. Four.
10	Q. Thank you. Turning your attention now,
11	if you would, to definition 991.13, the term, new
12	producer. Do you know why that definition appears at
13	the tail end of the definition section?
14	A. We had discussions with the Department as
15	this process went forward, and there was concern from
16	the Department's side that potentially a grower, a new
17	grower in crop year 2003, would be excluded from this
18	process. So this language was added in there so that
19	if, in fact, there were a bona fide new producer in
20	2003, that producer would be able to obtain allotment
21	base.
22	Q. We heard from a new grower yesterday.
23	Was this the type of situation that this language was
24	intended to encompass?
25	A. Yes. That grower yesterday was a new

1	grower in 2002, so he would have been covered under the
2	old formula, but there was a concern that somehow there
3	might be a new grower in '03, that would not be covered.
4	Q. I have reviewed this order and scanned it
5	for the term, new producer. I do see it appears at
6	Section 991.53, Sub-Section G. Is that the provision to
7	which you're referring?
8	A. Which is it again?
9	Q. 991.53, Sub G.
10	A. Yes, it is.
11	Q. I am going to ask you to read that into
12	the record just so we do have a clear record, sir.
13	A. "Notwithstanding the foregoing, any
14	person or entity who has entered the hop industry as a
15	new producer for the 2003, crop year shall be entitled
16	to an allotment base as a matter of right. Such
17	allotment base shall be calculated in the same manner as
18	with any other producer, provided, however, that that
19	that the new producers representative base period and
20	initial allotment base shall be limited exclusively to
21	the 2003, crop year, and any such allotment shall be
22	determined by the new producers' actual production in
23	2003.
24	Q. Thank you. Sir, I'm going to ask you to
25	jump ahead a little bit to the administrative
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	provisions, specifically Section 991.22, which sets
2	forth the powers of the administrative committee. And
3	in the context of that provision I'm going to ask to
4	borrow Exhibit 10 from the court reporter and have you
5	look at some of the comments that are included there.
6	Sir, Exhibit 10 is, as you recall, is the document that
7	was read into the record by Mr. Newhouse yesterday. Is
8	that right?
9	A. Yes, I do.
10	Q. And he had been assigned the role of
11	describing and articulating the particular provisions
12	that set forth the administrative committee's powers,
13	duties, et cetera.
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Could you read into the record the note
16	that Mr. Newhouse appended to his discussion for Section
17	991.22?
18	A. Yes, I will. "Note. The committee would
19	have the ability to exempt those producers for whom this
20	order is not intended. It is not the intention of the
21	order to restrict the actions of any brewer and their
22	growing activities, producing hops, used in their own
23	brewing operation."
24	Q. After yesterday's testimony has the
25	committee had the chance to gather and discuss that
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

note?
A. Yes, we have.
Q. Is it the position of the committee that
that is an accurate note, sir?
A. That is as accurate no, it is
inaccurate.
Q. Do you know what the basis, or rather the
background, of that note is?
A. In the beginning of the development of
this document there was quite some discussion about
actually exempting all breweries from this marketing
order. That would mean that any production that an
individual brewery had they would not be covered. There
was considerable objection to that from the growing
community. There was considerable concern from the
Department of Agriculture with regards to that type of
an exemption. It was in one of the original drafts. It
was subsequently taken out, and there is no exemption
for any producer in the marketing order, and although we
don't, you know, we agree we don't want to restrict
brewery activities, the any production by a brewery
is covered under this marketing order.
The other part of it where this all came was from the
original Hop Marketing Order. There were special
allotments granted in specific instances where breweries
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

ı	wanted a specific variety. That ability is still in
2	this marketing order. The committee can, if they wish,
3	grant additional allotment bases or base for specific
4	instances, specific varieties, or whatever.
5	So I think the problem we had was Mr. Newhouse, I don't
6	want to say got confused, but had not taken the language
7	that had been taken out out of his presentation. So
8	consequently these comments are not the intent of the
9	committee, nor are they reflected in the document
10	itself.
11	Q. Sir, you mentioned that the executive
12	committee, the administrative committee, I'm sorry, may
13	have the power to grant exemptions for particular
14	variety. I've perused this document. Is there
15	particular language that gives it that, or is that based
16	on the activity prior?
17	A. No. If I said exempt, what it this
18	document has the ability to grant additional allotment
19	for specific varieties or whatever the committee, the
20	administrative committee would wish. And that's under
21	the additional allotment section, where they can grant
22	additional allotments to growers based on the market
23	situation, based on a number of and I don't have that
24	right in front of me, but that's what I'm talking about.
25	Q. To your knowledge, sir, did that ever
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

i	happen under the prior Hop Marketing Order?
2	A. Yes, it did. There was a special fuggle
3	allotment set up for a specific brewery, and a number of
4	pounds set up under that special fuggle allotment of
5	which the growers who wished to grow fuggles had access
6	to.
7	Q. One of Mr. Newhouse's defenders to my
8	left has asked me to ask you if you're aware of
9	activities he may have had that have kept him busy since
10	the first draft until today?
11	A. Well, and I appreciate that, because, of
12	course, Mr. Newhouse is in our representative branch in
13	our State Government and was not at every one of these
14	meetings. And our original intent was that we could
15	divide this up for people to make the presentations and
16	then the people who had the most knowledge could then
17	answer any specific questions, and that didn't would out
18	so good.
19	So that's, you know, he had a lot of other duties, too,
20	and it was just an error.
21	Q. Thank you, sir.
22	* * *
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: How do you spell
24	fuggle?
25	MR. GASSELING: F-u-g-g-l-e.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
2	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, that concludes my
3	direct inquiry.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Mr.
5	Gasseling, you may present any other information that
6	you would like to present at this time.
7	MR. GASSELING: I think I'm done.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I would invite
9	questions for Mr. Gasseling. Let's begin with any
10	questions by those who are here who are in favor of the
11	proposals. Any clarifying questions or any other
12	questions?
13	There appearing to be none I would now invite
14	questions from those who are against the proposals. Mr
15	Moody.
16	MR. MOODY: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Is your mic close
18	to you?
19	MR. MOODY: Okay. Yes.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That's better.
21	MR. MOODY: All right.
22	***
23	BY MR. MOODY:
24	Q. Mr. Gasseling, I apologize for my
25	confusion. We'll try to work this out.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. Join the club.
2	Q. I want to first ask you about some
3	specific entities as to whether or not they'd be
4	characterized as a handler. If I understood your
5	testimony, you mentioned Haas and Stiener. In your view
6	those two entities would be handlers. And that Sierra
7	Chief would be handler, and Hop Union would be a
8	handler. Is that am I correct so far.
9	A. Yakima Chief?
10	Q. Yes.
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Okay. So those four entities are
13	handlers.
14	A. Would you repeat those again?
15	Q. Okay.
16	A. Because you confused me on Sierra Chief.
17	Q. Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize. I
18	just that's my own brewery, one of my brewery
19	preferences. All right. Haas and Stiener. You said
20	they're handlers. Yakima Chief and Hop Union. Those
21	two are also handlers.
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Okay. I want to ask you about some other
24	entities as to whether or not they're handlers. The
25	first one is Jaenicke, and that's spelled
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
1
       J-a-e-n-i-c-k-e.
                      Albert Jaenicke?
2
                  Α.
3
                  Q.
                       Yes.
                       I don't know.
                  Α.
4
                       Okay. Do you know the firm?
5
                  Q.
                       No. I know him, but I don't even know if
7
       he's selling hops or even doing anything now.
8
                  Q.
                       Okay. Hesselberger?
                                   ***
9
10
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody, would
        you spell these as you go along...
11
                  MR. MOODY: Yes.
12
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: ...as best you can?
13
                  MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. It's
14
        -- Hesselberger is H-e-s-s-e-l-b-e-r-g-e-r.
15
                  MR. GASSELING: That's a new one to me, too.
16
17
                  MR. MOODY: Okay.
18
        BY MR. MOODY:
19
                      Lupouk, L-u-p-o-u-k.
20
                  Q.
                      Well, they were a handler. I don't know
21
        whether they're still in existence or not, but they were
22
        a handler.
23
24
                       Okay. Lupex, L-u-p-e-x.
                  Q.
                       Have no idea who they are.
25
                  Α.
                          York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

1	Q. Hops Direct.
2	A. Have no idea.
3	Q. All right. Would European-based
4	companies that have relationships with producers and
5	acquire hops from US producers, would they be considered
6	handlers under your definition?
7	A. Yes. If they're let me clarify that.
8	If they are the first line of purchaser of US hops, then
9	they would be the handler. If they were purchased,
10	giving an example, through S. S. Stiener, then S. S.
11	Stiener turned around and sold those hops to one of
12	these dealers that you mentioned, then the handler would
13	be S. S. Stiener.
14	***
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We'll
16	change the tape at 8:23.
17	***
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
19	record. I said 9:23, and I meant excuse me. I said
20	8:23. I meant 9:23 that we were changing the tape.
21	All right. We're back on record now at 9:24.
22	Mr. Moody, you may proceed.
23	MR. MOODY:
24	Okay.
25	***
	37 1 0 1 7

1	BY MR. MOODY:
2	Q. One other entity I wanted to ask you
3	about, Mr. Gasseling, and that's Kalsek, K-a-l-s-e-k.
4	A. I don't know. We have a pretty sheltered
5	life out on the reservation, so, you know, there are not
6	too many people venture out there, and as I said, I deal
7	with basically two people, and I haven't dealt with
8	those other ones. So I don't know.
9	Q. Okay. How is it that and handlers
10	have certain legal responsibilities to the committee?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And among those are reporting and record
13	keeping?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And they can be subject to investigations
16	and audits and that sort of thing by the committee?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. All right. How is it that the committee
19	would have access to handlers and control over, legal
20	
	control over handlers based in Europe?
21	control over handlers based in Europe? A. Well, they would have to have business
21 22	
	A. Well, they would have to have business
22	A. Well, they would have to have business licenses, I would imagine, in the US and subject to US
22 23	A. Well, they would have to have business licenses, I would imagine, in the US and subject to US laws and regulations.

1	records?
2	A. Well, under the prior marketing order we
3	had the same situation, and those entities had no
4	problem reporting and taking care of the duties that
5	were required of them, and I would not see that that
6	would be any problem in this current marketing order
7	either.
8	Q. All right. So you're anticipating sort
9	of a degree of voluntary cooperation.
10	A. No. I consider it mandatory cooperation.
11	Q. All right. But how what in the
12	extent that the Hop Committee had a procedure where they
13	audited every handler's books every three years on a
14	rotating basis, I think it's pretty easy to see how
15	they'd audit the handlers in Yakima, but how would they
16	audit the handlers based in England or Germany?
17	A. Well, I would imagine that they all have
18	some kind of outlet in the US, and they would be
19	required to supply the information that was required by
20	law to verify what they have purchased and what their
21	responsibilities were. And if they refused to do it, I
22	think the Department of Agriculture is pretty intent on
23	making sure that people comply.
24	Q. All right. So to the extent that a
25	handler did not have business facilities in the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	production area, then the committee would look to USDA
2	for any compliance activities?
3	A. Well, I can't speak specifically for what
4	the committee might ultimately do, because I'm not on
5	that committee, and they haven't made that
6	determination, but if you had a situation where a
7	handler refused to cooperate or refused to abide by the
8	law, there's going to be repercussions. They're not
9	going to be doing business here very long I wouldn't
10	think.
11	Q. Is there any situation where a brewer
12	would be treated as a handler?
13	A. I think Anheuser-Busch with their own
14	farm production would be the handler.
15	Q. All right. And what under which
16	definition or which section of the definitions would
17	they be deemed a handler?
18	A. They acquire the hops.
19	Q. Well, I think you described them as a
20	producer.
21	A. No. Elk Mountain Farms, Busch Ag
22	Resources would be the producer. You know, Mr. Moody, I
23	don't know exactly how Anheuser-Busch has their
24	situation set up, but I have to believe that
25	Anheuser-Busch would deal in a fashion to make sure that
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	everything was legal and taken care of.
2	Q. All right. In a situation where a brewer
3	just went out and bought some land and grew hops for
4	their own use, how is it under your definitions they
5	would be treated as a handler? I'm looking at, I guess,
6	Section .08. Would it be use hops commercially of one's
7	one production?
8	A. It sounds reasonable.
9	Q. Okay. So there are situations where
10	brewers could and would be treated as handlers?
11	A. Yes. Could be.
12	Q. All right. Looking at your definition of
13	new producer
14	A. Yes.
15	Qand if I understand what you said is
16	that the only relevance of that term, new producer, is
17	to deal with the situation where somebody was a producer
18	only in '03. Is that the only relevance of the
19	definition, new producer?
20	A. That's what the statement says. It
21	refers to 2003.
22	Q. All right.
23	A. If you were a producer in 2002, and this
24	is 2003, you're not a new producer.
25	Q. Okay. But you'd be but if you were a
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	producer in '02, but not in '03, you'd still be entitled
2	to base?
3	A. Well, I think it ultimately will be
4	determined by what the ultimate periods that are set,
5	the eligibility periods for calculation of base, the
6	eligibility periods for the voting.
7	Q. Well, under the proposal here in the
8	Federal Register, if you're a producer in '02, but not
9	in '03, would you be entitled to base?
10	A. A producer, as it's set up here, is
11	entitled to a base calculation from the years 1997,
12	through 2002. So from that standpoint he would be
13	included in the base calculation.
14	Q. Even though he's not now a producer?
15	A. Well, then it comes down to what year
16	determines you use to determine a producer.
17	Q. Right. And I couldn't tell from the
18	Federal Register what your intent was.
19	A. Well, our intent was originally that you
20	had to be a producer in 2001. That was the original
21	intent, and then that was extended, I think, to 2002,
22	2001, or 2002. That was the criteria for being able to
23	be eligible for base allotment, and that's how it reads.
24	Q. Okay. So if you're if you are if
25	you were a producer in '01, or '02, you would be
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	entitled to base?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Okay. But if you were a producer in '97,
4	'98, '99, and 2000, you got out of the business, you
5	would not be entitled to base?
6	A. That's how it reads.
7	Q. Okay. But is that a correct statement if
8	you're in town?
9	A. Yes. And let me explain. The reason for
10	that was, again, it came down to discussions throughout
11	the industry that what happened in the original Hop
12	Marketing Order is they went back a number of years, and
13	people who were not bona fide producers were allowed to
14	acquire base, which created a problem where you had
15	people who were not producing hops having base. This
16	was set up so that if you were a producer in those
17	years, you were eligible. If you were not a producer in
18	those years, you were not eligible, and we set it up in
19	2001, because that's when we started the whole process
20	of setting up this marketing order, and all the growers
21	needed to be put on notice that this was the criteria
22	that was being used so that it would eliminate as much
23	as possible any kind of posturing or funny business of
24	trying to do things that might get you an inflated-base
25	allotment when you weren't entitled to it.

1	Q. Okay. So if you're a producer in '97,
2	'98, '99, 2000, and 2001, but not in 2002, not in 2003,
3	would you be entitled to base?
4	A. Well, I guess I would have to, you know,
5	take exception as to or not exception but have you
6	explain to me what you consider not a producer.
7	Q. Well, you're the order defines the
8	term, producer. Is that correct?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Okay. So you're when I say not a
11	producer, what I mean to say is whatever it is you're
12	doing you don't come within the definition of 06 for
13	producer.
14	A. Well, it says you're engaged in a
15	proprietary capacity in the commercial production of
16	hops. So to not be a producer you would have to be, in
17	my estimation, totally out of the business completely,
18	have no trellises, no kilns, no picking machine, no
19	infrastructure to be a producer. Just because you have
20	an idle hop yard for a given year, you made the
21	decision, you still have the proprietary portion within
22	this definition, so because you made a decision not to
23	grow or to grow in any given year doesn't mean you're
24	not a producer.
25	Q. Okay. To make my hypothetical simple,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	let's say in '97, '98, '99, 2000, 2001, you were a
2	producer, and you sell your farm at the end of 2001, and
3	you move to God forbid, New York City. Now, would you
4	be entitled to base?
5	A. The intent of the committee was that
6	acreage, whatever that acreage is counted once, not
7	twice. So the intent of the committee is not that that
8	individual who sold the operation would then get base,
9	and the person that purchased that operation would then
10	get base. It's the same land, so there can only be one
11	base go against that, and the intent was to stop the
12	actual trade of base allotment.
13	Q. Okay. I was going to get to that in a
14	second, but just with my first hypothetical here, this
15	owner and farmer and the producer for '97, to '01, sells
16	the farm, moves to New York. Is he entitled to base?
17	A. Well, I would say under the definition he
18	would be entitled to the base, but wherever the farm
19	went would not be.
20	Q. Okay. Let's say he sells the farm to a
21	new producer, brand new producer, who produces on in
22	'02, and '03. Would that person be entitled to base?
23	A. So he was would you repeat the
24	Q. Okay.
25	Ayour hypothetical?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Q. Right. Our first grower A produces '97,
2	to '01, and sells the farm, moves to New York. I think
3	you had said he, grower A, is entitled to base, because
4	he was a producer '97, to '01. And '01, being a
5	producer in '01, was the triggering event that entitled
6	you to base. So under that section he would be entitled
7	to base.
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Okay. Now, grower B bought the farm, and
10	he's a producer in '02, and '03, so under that same
11	provision since he's an '02, producer, he'd be entitled
12	to base.
13	A. Under that provision he would.
14	Q. Okay. So the same farm would then be
15	getting base in effect twice; once for grower A and once
16	for grower B.
17	A. Under the scenario they would, but that's
18	not the intent of this section for that to happen.
19	Q. Would the Proponent's Committee agree to
20	include a modification on in the section on allotment
21	base specifically providing that a given farm can only
22	get base once?
23	***
24	MR. MONAHAN: We are obviously willing to
25	consider any modifications that make sense. I
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Monahan, just
2	so the record's clear, it's you speaking now rather than
3	Mr. Gasseling.
4	MR. MONAHAN: I apologize, Your Honor. Yes.
5	Brendan Monahan for the Proponent's Committee. We would
6	be happy to do that, however, I would suggest that the
7	definition of producer and the way it relates to
8	commercial production makes that clear, at least in
9	light of your New Yorker scenario.
10	Any event, we would obviously consider any
11	reasonable modifications to make that intent clear.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: If I might just
13	inquire, with regard to Section 991.13, new producer, I
14	noticed that I would fit that definition, because I'm a
15	person who has not grown hops prior to 2003. So perhaps
16	it should be a producer who has not grown hops prior to
17	2003, rather than just person.
18	MR. MONAHAN: Mr. Gasseling, I'd ask you to
19	make that same proposal. I agree, Your Honor. In the
20	first in 991.13 is a person who has not grown hops
21	prior to 2003. Obviously, it needs to incorporate the
22	concept that that person is now growing crops in a
23	commercial capacity, and therefore, Mr. Gasseling, would
24	you agree that the word, person, in the first sentence
25	should be changed to producer?

l	MR. GASSELING: Yes.
2	MR. MOODY: Okay.
3	***
4	BY MR. MOODY:
5	Q. Now, let's say somebody is a producer in
6	'97, '98, '99, and 2000, and then they do not produce
7	hops in '01, or '02, but they nevertheless have their
8	hop yard there kind of on stand-by basis in case they
9	decide to get back in the industry at a later point.
10	But they've produced no commercial hops in '01, or '02.
11	Would they be entitled to base?
12	A. And they have the infrastructure and
13	everything? The yards are there, everything is in
14	place?
15	Q. Yes.
16	A. Yes. In my opinion they would.
17	Q. Right, but my concern is in '06, you have
18	to be engaged in the commercial production of hops, and
19	that seems to indicate that you have to produce a crop.
20	If you have some facilities there but you don't produce
21	a crop, you're at least under that language there you
22	wouldn't be considered a producer.
23	A. But you just read part of it. You didn't
24	read the part ahead of it, in a proprietary capacity,
25	which means you have ownership and a monetary investment
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	in that operation. So I interpreted, and it was the
2	intent of the committee not to exclude those people,
3	because they had the an investment. They were
4	involved, they had the ability, and the infrastructure
5	was there, and just because they didn't grow in one or
6	the other years and quite frankly, in those years we had
7	the set-aside program, in which growers voluntarily
8	participated in not growing, not because they were
9	getting out of the business, but because they were
10	trying to help alleviate the overproduction that was in
11	effect. And they set that acreage aside for that
12	reason, and you can't penalize people for that.
13	Q. Right. And the set-aside was '02. Is
14	that correct?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. So they would still be producers in '01.
17	A. They may well have been, but we also had
18	another voluntary program through the alliance where
19	people voluntarily left acres out, and they're still
20	producers.
21	Q. Okay. We had some good testimony
22	yesterday about the '02, set-aside. What other
23	set-aside are you referring to now?
24	A. Well, I think in Mr. Carpenter's
25	testimony he talked about the original industry

1	discussions with regards to the Hop Alliance, and that
2	was an a quasi organization formed to try to get a
3	handle on this overproduction and get voluntary grower
4	participation. And it took different forms, either to
5	reduce acreage, to put a certain percentage of your
6	production in an alliance pool, a number of different
7	factors, but, in fact, in those years there were growers
8	that left acres idle.
9	Q. That was in the those years you're
10	referring to, would that be '01?
11	A. I think it was, yeah. The process
12	started, I think, in 2000, but it was '01. In that
13	timeframe right there I'm not specific on I'd have to
14	look to see when the alliance actually started, but that
15	was also a consideration. So there were a number of
16	things going on in those years that and have been
17	going on to try to get a handle on this overproduction.
18	And in no way was it or is it the intent of the
19	committee to penalize those people who tried to do the
20	responsible thing.
21	Q. Okay. Suppose a producer produces '97,
22	to '00, but then takes down their trellises and plants
23	peach trees but still has a harvesting facility on

their, physically on their land, but in '01, and '02,

their land is being used for the commercial production

24

25

1	of peaches. Would they be entitled to receive a base?
2	A. You know, Mr. Mooney [sic], we can sit
3	here all day and do every supposition that you can think
4	of, and this document does not cover every possible one
5	you can come up with. And that's what the committee
6	would have to discern. There's a clause in here for the
7	hardship phase of it. If there is something that is a
8	real problem, the committee can designate a
9	sub-committee to address that. But you can sit here all
10	day and we can go over every possibility, and I can't
11	address every possibility. So if you do, I, you know,
12	you and I are going to be here a long time, but we're
13	not going to get anywhere.
14	The intent was not to penalize growers, and what you're
15	trying to get or to bring forward that if somebody left
16	his acreage idle but still had the infrastructure and
17	was a producer, and I consider a producer, and that
18	individual did it because of the to benefit the
19	industry, then they're a producer. And that was the
20	intent. That's how we've set it up. It won't hit every
21	item, but that those things as they were in the
22	original order, will be addressed.
23	And in the original order there were all kinds of
24	hardship cases, you know. My wife left me yesterday,
25	and I forgot to put my hops in, you know, pick them the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	right time. I mean, there were all kinds of potential
2	hardships, so that's where the committee comes in. And
3	for you and I to sit here this whole time and hit every
4	possibility, I can't do that.
5	Q. All right. Well, Mr. Gasseling, I mean,
6	the reason I'm asking at least some of these, you know,
7	to flush this out a little bit is because since base
8	could have a value potentially of several dollars a
9	pound, and people who are present producers may need to
10	buy, you know, enough pounds to cover their acreage from
11	people who haven't produced hops for years, physically
12	produced the hops, it is a very vital and valid economic
13	concern. We had one fellow yesterday from Idaho testify
14	he'd be out of business if he had to buy base.
15	So I know my questions may seem that they deal with kind
16	of hypothetical situations, but they can profoundly
17	affect the future of a producer who's producing hops
18	commercially today.
19	A. Well, I have some knowledge of that area.
20	I spent a number of years, and I think that statement
21	was a little bit overblown. I don't because it
22	takes, there's so many variables out there as to what it

A. Well, I have some knowledge of that area. I spent a number of years, and I think that statement was a little bit overblown. I don't -- because it takes, there's so many variables out there as to what it would cost for base, what it would cost to do this, to do that, and there was no verification that that, in fact, was -- would be the case with this grower. And so York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	I think it comes down to the fact that, again, as Ben
2	testified, if it if the marketing order works
3	properly, there will be some value. And that value is
4	more than offset by the benefits. But that testimony, I
5	know the individual, and I know that they're opposed to
6	the marketing order, but I don't take that comment that
7	if he had to purchase allotment, he would be broke.
8	Q. All right. You mean your
9	A. That's my opinion.
10	Q. Okay.
11	***
12	MR. MOODY: Maybe this is a question better
13	for Brendan. Are you going to have another witness
14	who's going to specifically address the how base
15	allotment is handed out, Mr. Monahan, or is this the
16	best witness for that?
17	MR. MONAHAN: What do you mean, how base
18	allotment is handed out?
19	MR. MOODY: Well, I mean, why it was the top
20	year rather than the average and some of those
21	considerations.
22	MR. MONAHAN: There's certainly a section that
23	we will be getting into regarding how base allotment is
24	calculated.
25	MR. MOODY: Okay.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: If I could ask a
2	question. Where are the hardship provisions or I
3	would just like to look at those while Mr. Gasseling has
4	raised that as a possibility, Mr. Moody.
5	MR. GASSELING: Well, Your Honor, it's in
6	Section 991.53B5.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. I'd
8	just like to read that. In fact, would you, Mr.
9	Gasseling, just read that into the record while we're on
10	this discussion.
11	MR. GASSELING: This is Section 991.53B5.
12	"The executive sub-committee shall act as a hardship
13	committee for establishment of initial allotment base.
14	Any producer has the right to petition the hardship
15	committee for special consideration for their initial
16	allotment base, provided that such position is in
17	writing and"
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Such petition?
19	MR. GASSELING: Oh, excuse me. "Such petition
20	is in writing and that it is based solely on hardships
21	brought about by acts of God. The hardship committee
22	may elect to defer their decision to the administrative
23	committee."
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
25	you. Mr. Gasseling, I just wanted also to weigh in on

1	your concern about being given so many hypotheticals.
2	Because if these regulations, these proposed rules
3	actually, become regulations, they will be rigidly
4	applied, it's necessary to pose hypotheticals to see
5	where problem areas might arise. Because regulations
6	may lock in the administering committee in such way that
7	they can't make exceptions.
8	So I note that particular provision, if it's
9	limited to acts of God, there might be things that the
10	committee would like to do that it would not be
11	permitted to do.
12	So, Mr. Moody, do not be discouraged in
13	offering hypotheticals that might expose inequities that
14	might occur if the regulations indeed have to be applied
15	as written.
16	MR. MOODY: All right.
17	***
18	BY MR. MOODY:
19	Q. Mr. Gasseling, you talked briefly about
20	the committee's power to grant, in effect, an exemption
21	to cover the situation of the fuggle hops, and $I^\prime m$
22	trying to understand in the order where that authority
23	comes from.
24	A. Well, I gave that as an example of what
25	the previous committee did. There is in let me

•	give me a second, and I II IIII IC.
2	Q. I'm looking at 553E. That's the section
3	on additional allotment base, if that's what you're
4	referring to.
5	A. Well, also Section D, which states,
6	"Adjustment to allotment base periodically, but at least
7	once every five years, the committee shall review and
8	may adjust each producers' allotment base to recognize
9	changes in trends, production demand, and any such
10	adjustment may be made in accordance with the formula
11	prescribed by the committee with the approval of the
12	Department, with the approval of the Secretary."
13	Additional base allotment then goes on that
14	they can make additional base allotment available in a
15	certain amount.
16	Q. All right. But is there a provision in
17	this order similar to the authority under the old order,
18	where they basically just granted an exception, an
19	exemption for the fuggle hops.
20	A. Well, I think there's enough leeway in
21	that section that the committee could make additional
22	base allotment available to all growers for a specific
23	variety or varieties.
24	Q. Under E?
25	A. Under D.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Q. Under D?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Okay. D seems to be limited to
4	situations where it would apply to an existing
5	producer's allotment base and not somebody who wanted to
6	come into the industry with a brand new experimental
7	variety, for example, which is what fuggles were.
8	A. Well, they weren't an experimental
9	variety. They were one of the old, established
10	varieties in the State of Oregon, and they were used
11	specifically for one brewer, and that brewer was very
12	concerned that that hops would not be able to be
13	delivered, so the committee set up a special fuggle
14	allotment and a certain amount of pounds, and those
15	pounds were available to any grower who wished to grow
16	fuggles.
17	Q. Okay. So the present authority to do
18	what you did with fuggles would be this 553 or 991.53D.
19	Is that correct?
20	A. I would put it under that category.
21	Q. Okay. Since
22	A. Let me explain. The fuggle situation was
23	an allotment, special allotment that was made available
24	to all growers. Any grower could take it, but growers
25	in Washington didn't want to grow fuggles. Growers in
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Oregon did, and	they utilized it. The Washington
2	growers for the	most part didn't.
3	Q.	Okay. So in the fuggle situation that
4	wasn't really a	djusting an existing base. It was
5	providing new b	base for the fuggle variety. Is that
6	correct?	
7	Α.	Well, it was adjusting base. It was
8	making addition	aal base available, so it was an
9	adjustment.	
10	Q.	All right. But it was specifically tied
11	to fuggle. You	had to produce the fuggle variety.
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	Okay. If I understand the base allotment
14	now is actually	y expressed in pounds of alpha acid?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	So if I've got a base allotment of 10,000
17	pounds, under t	the proposal I can produce any variety of
18	hops.	
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	Or change my varieties.
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	Or produce a new variety that is not
23	been presently	produced.
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	Okay. But the base allotment that I have York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	as a producer isn't tied to my variety.
2	A. It's tied to alpha.
3	Q. Just is tied to alpha pounds.
4	A. Yeah.
5	Q. Okay. So how would you do and again,
6	in looking at D in terms of adjustment to allotment
7	base, again, I don't see anything in there dealing with
8	authority to authorize base limited to specific
9	varieties. And I'm just wondering where you're getting
10	that authority from.
11	A. Well, I think I would interpret it to
12	be under changes in trends in production and demand.
13	Q. All right. But
14	A. And the committee and that that
15	formula can be prescribed by the committee. So it's my
16	feeling that the committee would have the ability to
17	address a specific issue that was not basically in the
18	mainstream of the operation of the order.
19	Q. Okay. So even though base is expressed
20	as pounds of alpha acid, you're saying that under this
21	section the committee would have the authority to
22	express or to hand out base in terms of variety,
23	specific to variety, not limited alpha acid pounds?
24	A. Well, I think they would have the ability
25	to grant additional allotment, alpha allotment for a
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	specific variety. That's how I would see it. If they
2	did, I mean, I feel that they would have the ability to
3	do that, but that would be totally at the discretion of
4	the committee with the approval of the Secretary to do
5	something like that.
6	MR. MONAHAN: Jim, I don't want to limit your
7	cross examination or tell you when to ask which
8	questions, but we are spending a lot of time now with
9	Section 991.53. That is part of our anticipated
0	presentation. Because of the changes that we have made
1	and because of today's limited hearing time, we had
12	intended to defer the allotment issues to the Yakima
13	hearing.
14	MR. MOODY: Oh, good. And will there also be
15	a witness who will be available to discuss the modified
16	effort requirement as well?
17	MR. MONAHAN: Mr. Gasseling, Mr. Carpenter,
18	Mr. Roy are going to talk about all of the provisions
19	that appear between 991.50 and 991.58, your meat and
20	potatoes provisions, Jim.
21	MR. MOODY: In Yakima?
22	MR. MONAHAN: In Yakima.
23	MR. MOODY: Okay.
24	MR. MONAHAN: That is true. You can ask all
25	you want of this witness, because eventually he'll be or

1	the stand to answer these things, but we have not
2	presented them. They're not ripe as it were for
3	presentation at the moment, and we were going to
4	dedicate this morning to presentation of more of the
5	procedural
6	MR. MOODY: Okay.
7	MR. MONAHAN:technical components
8	MR. MOODY: All right.
9	MR. MONAHAN:of the order.
10	MR. MOODY: All right.
11	***
12	BY MR. MOODY:
13	Q. In getting back to 06, Mr. Gasseling,
14	under your definition of producer, is there any
15	authority there in that section or in any other section
16	to in any way exempt any kind of a producer from the
17	requirement to have base allotment?
18	A. I don't understand that question.
19	Q. Okay. It kind of goes to the question
20	about the brewer exemption, which you're deleting now,
21	but I just want to make sure there's no other than
22	brewers who are producers, is there any other kind of
23	producer that might be entitled to any kind of an
24	exemption from having base allotment?
25	A. Brewers are not exempt.
	Vaule Stangaroninia Caminaga Ing

1	Q. Right. That's the change you're making.
2	I understand that, but is there any other kind of a
3	producer besides a brewer, any kind of a producer that
4	would be entitled to produce hops without having an
5	allotment?
6	A. Well, you can under this proposal you
7	can anybody can produce hops, but without allotments
8	you cannot move them into the trade. You can't sell
9	them, so anybody can produce hops. They have to have
0	allotment in order to sell them.
11	Q. Okay. And I want to talk about leasehold
12	interest for a second. If I don't own producing land,
13	if I just lease it from somebody else, under what
14	circumstances would I become a producer for the purposes
15	of 06?
16	A. Well, in our situation we lease a lot of
17	land, and we grow hops in that leased land, and we would
18	be the producer.
19	Q. Okay. Would the person you lease the
20	land from be a producer?
21	A. No.
22	Q. What if they retain a half interest in
23	the crop? Would they be a producer?
24	A. Well, they would have a proprietary
25	interest in the crop, so if half the crop was theirs,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	they would be a producer, I would think.
2	Q. Okay. So the same farm under that
3	hypothetical, the same farm could have two producers,
4	one the leasor and one the leasee.
5	A. For what reason? I mean, for voting
6	reasons, for what would be I don't quite
7	understand where you're
8	Q. All right. Well, then let's back up one
9	click. Does this section on defining a producer, does
10	this determine eligibility to vote for committee
11	members, or does it determine eligibility to vote in
12	referendums, or both?
13	A. This is for voting for just a minute.
14	Let me read this for sure. This would cover voting for
15	representation. Again, the Department's going to we
16	are going to make a recommendation later as to how we
17	would see the procedure for grower referendum or grower
18	voting in the referendum, but the critical thing, the
19	intent all along in this is that it's one grower, one
20	vote.
21	Q. But all your testimony relates not to
22	who's entitled to vote in a referendum but just who's
23	entitled to receive allotment base and vote for
24	committee members.
25	A. I think if the it depends what the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

L	Department sets as their criteria for that voting
2	referendum, but this refers to how you vote for your
3	representation.
4	Q. Okay. So and there'll, if I
5	understand correctly, there'll be witness or witnesses
6	later to address the referendum issues.
7	A. Well, we will have testimony as to what
8	our recommendation would be to the Department as to how
9	that determination should be made.
10	Q. Okay. In a situation where in
11	determining your primary entity test, if a father owns
12	one farm, and the father and a son own another farm,
13	does that is that, since there is common ownership
14	there, would that be counted as one entity or two?
15	A. Well, ultimately, the committee would
16	have to make that determination, but I think it would
17	you would then, you would go from the common
18	ownership to is there common banking, is there other
19	things that would show that they are, in fact, two
20	distinct, separate entities versus basically one
21	organization that has is operating under two
22	different names. And again, this goes back to the fact
23	that it was very, very apparent from the growers that
24	that would be a rigid test that would have to be made
25	before those types of things would be allowed. So I
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

ì	think you would have to see how the rest of the
2	structure was set up. If, in my opinion, if the
3	banking and everything was done through the father's
4	organization, all through the father, then they would be
5	one organization. And in the mint business of which I
6	operate under the Mint Marketing Order, there's very
7	specific rules and regulations for what new growers are
8	and how they can attain base, and you can't just say
9	that I'm the son of this grower, and I want base. You
10	have to, in fact, show that you are operating
11	separately.

Q. All right. What provisions will there be for transparency and accountability, meaning that will the committee publish sufficiently in advance of elections lists of handlers and lists of growers so that the people in the industry will be informed of who the committee believes are handlers and growers and would have an opportunity to challenge those determinations?

A. Well, there would definitely be a list of growers, and they may well have a list of handlers so they know who is responsible for taking care of collection of fees and so forth and record keeping, so I would imagine the committee would have a record of all of that.

Q. Okay. And those lists will be made York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	publicly available?
2	***
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody, we may
4	need to change the tape.
5	MR. MOODY: Okay.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: So I would like to
7	take a 15-minute break at this time. Please be back and
8	ready to go at 10:25.
9	***
10	[Tape 2 Side 1]
11	***
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
13	record now at 10:29. Mr. Moody, you may resume.
14	MR. MOODY: Thank you, Your Honor.
15	MR. GASSELING: Mr. Moody, before you continue
16	would it be okay if I clarify a couple of things that I
17	think were a little bit I might have not understood
18	your questions or conveyed it in the proper manner, and
19	it had to do with who's responsible when it's a foreign
20	entity?
21	The way it's set up is that if it's a if a
22	grower sells to a foreign entity, dealer, or brewer, the
23	grower is the handler, and he's responsible for the
24	requirements. I was thinking with regards if they were
25	had actual offices and businesses here in the US and
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	were situated in business licenses. So but if they
2	sell to a foreign one, the grower becomes the handler.
3	Secondly, the question about a brewery
4	operation. If the brewery operation has a growing
5	operation, the growing operation is the handler. In
6	most in some cases it may be the same entity, but if
7	they're not, it's the same situation as any other grower
8	who sells to a brewery. He would be or that entity
9	would be the handler.
10	So I hope that clarifies.
11	MR. MOODY: Okay.
12	***
13	BY MR. MOODY:
14	Q. But if the brewery just buys some land in
15	its own name and grows hops for its own use, who would
16	be the handler in that situation?
17	A. Whoever is growing it. In this case it
18	would be the brewery, so they would be the handler.
19	Q. Okay. Just a couple of quick follow-ups,
20	and then I'm done. On the you deleted the term,
21	independent, in front of producer in terms of
22	eligibility for membership.
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. All right. Does that mean that if I'm a
25	bona fide producer, that I don't lose my eligibility to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	be on the committee if I happen to work for a handler or
2	even be a handler?
3	A. If you're a producer?
4	Q. Yes.
5	A. As long as you're a producer you don't
6	lose that. The independent, as I said originally, was
7	had to do in the old order where there was a co-op
8	involved in the calculation, so there were cooperative
9	members, and they were what was called independent
10	members. And we don't have a cooperative situation
11	here, and we don't have the distinction between a member
12	and an independent or an the word independent. So it
13	just needs to be taken out.
14	Q. Okay. So if somebody's a producer on a
15	farm as a partner in a farm, and they happen to also
16	work at the marketing office of Yakima Chief, they'd be
17	entitled to serve on the committee?
18	A. If they're a producer, yes.
19	Q. Okay. Or if they're an employee of a
20	producer, they'd also be entitled to serve on the
21	committee.
22	A. I think that's what it says in there.
23	Q. Okay. So you don't there's nothing
24	as long as you are a producer, there's nothing you
25	can do, no nothing you can do in the hop industry,

York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	anyway, that will divest you of your right to serve on
2	the committee.
3	A. Other than some kind of fraud or
4	something.
5	Q. There's no employment relationship in the
6	hop industry or marketing activity that will divest you
7	of your right to serve on the committee.
8	A. Well, given the criteria that you've
9	alluded to, no, but again, it comes I think it comes
10	back to that if there was some kind of a very
11	transparent attempt to circumvent, there would be some
12	question. And I think that's a critical issue with
13	regards to the hop industry as well as the mint
14	industry. It's a very transparent industry. We're not
15	very big. Everybody knows everybody. It's pretty hard
16	to pull the wool over somebody's eyes, so I think that
17	given that scenario it would be pretty evident. Plus in
18	order to get voted on the committee, you have to be
19	or to get on the committee you have to be voted on.
20	Q. Right. And the reason I asked the
21	question is because some orders have tried to get what
22	they call a pure grower category of members on the
23	committee, people who are grower onlys and don't have
24	various marketing affiliations.
25	A. Well, the old Hop Order was that way. We
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	had a we had the grower committee, and we had the
2	dealer committee, and they were totally separate, and
3	they were set up specifically with the exception of the
4	co-op purely dealer. I mean, a dealer or a dealer
5	representative, even though we were, in my case with
6	John I. Haas, I could not be on the committee, and I was
7	an employee, because we were dealers, and we were on the
8	hop advisory board and not allowed to be on the so
9	that, you know, that was a specific thing in that order,
0	but in this order if you're a bona fide producer or an
11	employer of a bona fide employee, you have the
12	ability to serve.
13	Q. Okay. All right. You're a grower in
14	Washington state. Is that correct?
15	A. Yes, I am.
16	Q. Okay. Did you know or are you aware of
17	the fact that in Washington by statute they define what
18	a producer is? And it's defined as a producer who is,
19	and I quote, "Engaged in the business of producing any
20	agricultural commodity for a market in commercial
21	quantities." And that's RCW 15.65.020, Sub-Section 10.
22	And I ask you this question in reference to your
23	statement that you could, in your view the order defines
24	a producer as somebody who has facilities for production
25	but doesn't actually produce the commodity.

1	***
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody, I think
3	that's a mischaracterization of what the witness said.
4	MR. MOODY: Okay. Then I apologize, Mr.
5	Gasseling. I let's go back to that.
6	* * *
7	BY MR. MOODY:
8	Q. If you in '01, or '01, and '02, if
9	you have if you don't produce hops but you have
10	facilities for the production of hops, would you be
11	considered a producer?
12	A. Ask the question again.
13	Q. Okay. For these critical years, '01, and
14	'02
15	A. Okay.
16	Qif you don't actually produce hops
17	commercially, you have no production, no harvesting from
18	your land, but you have facilities for the production of
19	hops, would you be considered a producer under your
20	definition?
21	* * *
22	MR. MONAHAN: Just I would register an
23	objection as to the completeness of the hypothetical and
24	would ask with permission of the Court if under this
25	hypothetical this grower person entity actually has hops York Stenographic Services. Inc.

1	growing on the operation that are not being sold.
2	MR. MOODY: Right. No hops grown, just but
3	just the facilities that could potentially be used for
4	the growing and harvesting of hops.
5	MR. GASSELING: I'm really confused now.
6	MR. MOODY: Okay.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody, perhaps
8	you misunderstood my comment as well. I thought that
9	the witness had previously testified that a person who
10	is growing hops would be a producer. And in addition to
11	that a person who had the equipment to do them but may
12	have laid out a season, those are my terms, would also
13	still be eligible.
14	I don't want to go back through all his
15	testimony, and I don't want to start over there, but I
16	thought what you had just said eliminated the growing
17	aspect of it entirely, and this witness did not do that.
18	He just indicated that one who was ordinarily engaged in
19	growing who for some reason had idled his production for
20	a season would not be eliminated. That's what I
21	thought.
22	MR. GASSELING: Your Honor, would you like to
23	come over here? That's basically what I said when you
24	gave that scenario. I used the proprietary example.
25	MR. MOODY: Okay.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	***
2	BY MR. MOODY:
3	Q. But your definition then of producer
4	would then be a little broader than the definition of
5	producer by statute in Washington?
6	A. Well, I don't have the statute in front
7	of me, so I would if you could read it again so I
8	could hear it. I mean
9	Q. Okay. It's the emphasis I'm sort of
10	focusing on here is the part that says, "Engaged in th
11	business of producing any agricultural commodity for
12	market in commercial quantities."
13	***
14	MR. MONAHAN: For clarification, Mr. Moody,
15	what statute's that from?
16	MR. MOODY: It's RCW 15.65.020, Sub-Section
17	10.
18	MR. MONAHAN: What's the title? What's the
19	subject matter of the
20	MR. MOODY: It's in the definition section.
21	It just defines the word, producer.
22	MR. MONAHAN: Definitions of what?
23	MR. MOODY: Agricultural producer.
24	MR. MONAHAN: I'm trying to figure out what
25	the subject matter of the statute is. Is it a tax
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
1
       statute? Is it a withholding statute?
2
                 MR. MOODY: It's the Washington Hop Commission
3
      Law.
4
                 MR. MONAHAN: Thank you.
                 MR. GASSELING: Well, all I know is that that
5
      wording is used in the Mint Marketing Order. It's been
6
       accepted and operational, and the growers in part of that
7
       are in the State of Washington, so I have to believe that
8
9
       the definition that we've got here is acceptable. But
       the critical thing is is I think you're alluding to the
10
       commercial production, and you're making the assumption
11
       just because I made a decision not to astring [ph] either
12
13
       a portion or all of my acreage due to whatever
14
       circumstances, somehow I'm not engaged in commercial
       production of that product. I mean, I have the
15
       proprietary interest in that. I have all of the expenses
16
17
       in it. I have all of the facilities. I have all of the
18
       infrastructure, and so I am still engaged in the
19
       commercial production of hops.
20
                  And so I think there's theoretically, if you
21
       take to where you want to go under the marketing order,
22
       if I had hops in the allotment, this is getting into
23
       another area, and decided not to -- which is one of the
       options, decided not to grow and use that product, I
24
25
       wouldn't be commercially in the business of hops. And
                         York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

.

1	that's not the case.
2	MR. MOODY: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr.
3	Gasseling. I appreciate it. Nothing further, Your
4	Honor.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
6	Moody. Additional questions for Mr. Gasseling. Mr.
7	Carswell.
8	MR. CARSWELL: Yes.
9	* * *
10	BY MR. CARSWELL:
11	Q. Mr. Gasseling, I just actually don't have
12	any questions about this. I will about have some
13	questions about and when I say this, I'm referring to
14	991.06 or other procedural provisions. I will have some
15	questions about 991.50 and subsequent provisions when we
16	get into next week.
17	I did, however, want to address a comment you
18	made earlier about a witness that we had yesterday here,
19	Mr. Wilmunster. That's spelled W-i-l-m-u-n-s-t-e-r, and
20	his first name was John, J-o-h-n. I believe I heard you
21	mention
22	***
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I think his name
24	Jon was J-o-n.
25	MR. CARSWELL: Okay. Then I've got it
	York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077
	54 Holdi George St., 10th, 1 A 17401 - (717) 054-0077

1	misspelled here. I apologize.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And I think he
3	said his spelling was W-e-i-l-m-u-n-s-t-e-r.
4	MR. CARSWELL: I'm being told you are quite
5	correct, Your Honor.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Go
7	ahead.
8	***
9	BY MR. CARSWELL:
10	Q. And you mentioned or you stated that you
11	didn't believe his testimony yesterday that by having to
12	acquire base that he would be put out of business. I
13	would ask you, if you could, to explain the basis or
14	bases for that opinion.
15	A. Well, I didn't say that exactly. I said
16	that it's hard to make that comment when you don't have
17	any indication of what that potential additional
18	allotment base might cost you or how much additional
19	allotment base you might need or what that allotment
20	program might do to the market, affect the market
21	itself. I mean, and I said this is my opinion. I don't
22	believe that you can just make that blanket statement
23	without all of those major factors. I if additional
24	allotment base costs me \$1, in my operation we wouldn't
25	go broke. Now, \$2 we might go broke but not \$1. So
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	with all of those, you is making my point was ne made
2	a statement that was made without any knowledge of what
3	those additional costs, if any, might be.
4	Q. So what you just indicated is that if
5	base prices were set at a certain amount, at a high
6	amount, it's hypothetically possible that it could make
7	some growers go broke?
8	A. Well, hypothetically it might, but you
9	have to understand that the committee took tremendous
10	time and effort to develop a program, and I think Mr.
11	Carpenter alluded to it earlier, that would put
12	substantial additional base in the front end to
13	alleviate as much as you possible can the potential for
14	that base in the beginning having value, to eliminate
15	the impact that Mr. Weilmunster was alluding to as much
16	as you absolutely could.
17	Q. But putting the allotment at that level,
18	though, aren't you also creating a situation where to
19	reduce the supply of hops, you would have to drastically
20	reduce the amount of salable quantity, thus increasing
21	the need for base?
22	A. Not necessarily. You have, and there'll
23	be testimony, but the way the calculation is there's
24	excess base out there even with a cut in allotment.
25	There would be excess base out there. Now, I can't say
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	what the cut would be or if there would be a cut.
2	That's up to the committee, and so depending on what the
3	committee did, it would directly have an effect on the
4	allotment base available, but the calculation is that
5	there will be and the premise that the committee went
6	on that there will be substantial base available for
7	growers who need it. And based on bona fide effort and
8	all these other issues we'll get into, the grower that
9	isn't using it is going to lose it.
10	Q. Do you believe that base will have some
11	value, any value?
12	A. When?
13	Q. After a cut, after the setting of the
14	allotments and a presumable cut. I mean, you have to
15	cut, or you're not going to cut, you're not going to
16	regulate production to prevent what you believe is
17	oversupply. Correct?
18	A. Well, if you take the premise that Mr.
19	Smith put forth that we are relatively in balance given
20	the situation, and that we don't produce any more than
21	what we did this year from next year, we could
22	potentially stay in balance, then the amount produced
23	was the right amount. And so most of the cuts in many

instances are already there, and the percentage cut

would not take away from the production that's there.

24

25

1	Q. When you're setting the base, though,
2	you're taking the best year over the last five years for
3	each grower. Correct?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. So
6	A. Well, it's actually more than that right
7	now. It goes to 2002.
8	Q. Six years?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. So you take the best year of each grower,
11	you're going to have a base that's going to be higher
12	than last year's production, aren't you?
13	A. You will have an inflated base. Yes.
14	Q. So it would you presumably would have
15	to have a cut in that base to even go back to this
16	previous year's level. Isn't that correct?
17	A. There would have to, you know, most
18	likely have to be a cut, but that, again, comes down to
19	the specific situation that the committee would address.
20	What this committee, the Proponent's Committee tried to
21	do is put the framework together for the administrative
22	committee to work under and to set it up so that it's a
23	two-fold situation. We all understand that the big
24	problem is in the alpha acid side. There was, after
25	much discussion there was an alpha factor involved for
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

- 1 the aroma, so the aroma side would not get affected by a 2 cut in the saleable. 3 But because of that it would allow for excess base out there in the front end, which we fully believed there 4 5 will be substantial amount. Growers will have to either use it or get rid of it, so the premise we're going under is that it will have very little, if any, value in 7 8 the beginning, especially if there's no market. 9 Presuming that -- let's presume for a 10 second since I'm not going to get you to state that you think base is going to have a value, I think Mr. Smith 11 probably did that yesterday, but we'll let the record 12 show whether he did or didn't. 13 14 No, and let me clarify. Ultimately, if the -- this is my belief. Ultimately, if the marketing 15 16 order works properly... 17 Q. 18 ...by its nature the allotment base will 19 have some value. If it doesn't work properly, it'll 20 have zero value. 21 Q. And there will -- if it has value, then 22 presumably there will be people who are acquiring base.
 - York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 (717) 854-0077

If it has a value, and I acquire base,

Is that -- and paying for base. Is that accurate?

Α.

I'll have to pay for it.

23

24

25

1	Q. Now, someone who's presume that
2	there's a grower. Let's take an Idaho grower. Let's
3	take one of the Idaho growers who were here yesterday.
4	Let's take Mr. Weilmunster, and let's presume that he
5	has to acquire base under the marketing order. Just
6	from a philosophical standpoint, why would an American
7	grower who is growing hops, why should he be forced to
8	pay someone who's selling his ability to grow hops money
9	just to be able to grow hops?
10	***
11	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, I'm going to object
12	to the form of the question on a couple of bases. I
13	don't think we're here to discuss philosophies. I would
14	submit it's argumentative, and I think most importantly
15	we've addressed this philosophical issue in detail in
16	the three hour cross examination of Mr. Smith.
17	MR. CARSWELL: Not with this witness, Your
18	Honor.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Philosophy does
20	have a lot to do with the outcome of this proceeding,
21	but the question is in some ways an argumentative one,
22	but nevertheless, I believe this witness is capable of
23	fielding it. The fact that it may have been answered by
24	a different witness does not preclude counsel from
25	asking this witness.
	Vork Stenographic Services Inc

1	But would you repeat your question and then
2	I'll ask Mr. Gasseling to answer it.
3	***
4	BY MR. CARSWELL:
5	Q. Why should an American hops grower who is
6	opposed to the Hop Marketing Order be forced, if,
7	indeed, he is required to keep his production level to
8	acquire base, and he's going to have to pay for it, why
9	should he have to pay base just to grow hops in this
10	country?
11	A. Well, first of all, we have a process, a
12	legal process that we are going through right now, and
13	when this part of the process is completed, the growers
14	hopefully will have the opportunity to vote. If the
15	majority as it's set up in the statute vote in favor,
16	then this marketing order will be implemented. And if
17	it is implemented and some people are producing more
18	than their annual allotment, they have an option to
19	produce less, just as somebody who's producing less has
20	the right to produce more. They have a right through
21	the procedures to acquire allotment. They have the
22	right to lobby the committee to increase the saleable.
23	Nobody has to buy allotment. You make a choice based or
24	your specific situation.
25	If it were put into effect, and let's take the grower

1	from Idaho, if having to buy additional allotment would
2	put him out of business, I guess he wouldn't buy the
3	additional allotment.
4	Q. And he would sell and then he would
5	sell less hops if he needed that allotment to maintain
6	his production, and as he testified yesterday, that
7	would put him out of business.
8	A. That's an economic decision he has to
9	make. He has the ability to transfer his base to
0	somebody. He has to make his own economic decision. I
1	can't make that for him, but we have you cannot
12	Q. I think you're trying to make that for
13	him by getting this order passed.
14	A. No. Well
15	***
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Carswell, don't
17	cut him off, please.
18	MR. CARSWELL: Yes, ma'am.
19	MR. GASSELING: What we have is a process. We
20	as the committee have put together a proposal with the
21	input of the industry and Idaho's input to try to be as
22	absolutely fair as we can be. Now, given that, I don't
23	know of any type of program, a mandatory program, that
24	is fair to everybody. There is going to be some people
25	have a certain situation that's not going to benefit
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	them. But it's not just what we're talking about there.
2	It's everywhere. I don't necessarily agree with minimum
3	wage in Washington, but you know what? It may put me
4	out of business next year, because it's going up. Is
5	that fair? Should the state be about to put me out of
6	business?
7	So it's not a situation where we're focusing
8	on one particular area. It may well be that one person
9	might go out, and this is hypothetical, and two or three
10	might have the ability to survive. I don't know, but
11	all I can say is we've made a very conscious effort to
12	address all these concerns, whether they're brewery
13	concerns or growers concerns. And this input came from
14	all of the growers, Idaho included.
15	MR. CARSWELL: Mr. Gasseling, thank you. I
16	really do apologize for cutting you off a minute ago.
17	Thank you, sir.
18	MR. GASSELING: No problem.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
20	Carswell. Additional questions for Mr. Gasseling? All
21	right. I'll entertain Government questions at this
22	time. Ms. Deskins. Ms. Finn.
23	MS. FINN: Thank you.
24	***
25	BY MS. FINN:

1	Q. In looking at the definition, starting to
2	read through the definitions and stopping on hops and
3	hop products, I think that perhaps we need to get some
4	information on the record and as well as for the people
5	in this room that don't know a lot about how hops are
6	processed. It would be helpful to get some information
7	on the harvesting and processing of hops and when do
8	hops become turn into alpha acid. Looking through
9	the definitions, too, I did not see a definition of
10	alpha acid, so some clarify on exactly what alpha acid
11	is would be helpful.
12	So if you could perhaps describe perhaps from harvest
13	time to what happens to the hops and when they are
14	converted into alpha acid.
15	A. Okay. First of all, the growing season
16	starts in early spring. The hops are twined. They grow
17	with twine that goes up on a 20-foot trellis. The hops
18	grow through the season, and there are cones that
19	develop on the plant. Some liken them to a, what do you
20	call, pinecone. Thank you. And they're, depending on
21	the variety, they become ready for harvest the early to
22	mid part of August, from the 10th on.
23	And these hops are harvested through most growers
24	have stationary picking facilities that actually strip
25	all of the cones and leaves off of the vine, and then
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	the leaves are separated, and the cones are then sent
2	into a large dryer, where there are what we call kilns.
3	There are other growers who have portable picking
4	machines that actually strip the hops in the field, and
5	then that product is taken to a stationary machine, and
6	the leaves are separated so that we end up with nothing
7	but a hop cone.
8	Then those hop cones, as I said before, go into the
9	drying kilns. Usually they're floors that are 8 to 10
10	feet off of the ground, and they have they're most
11	of them are 32 by 32, but there are different sizes.
12	That's the size of the kiln floor. There's a slated
13	floor. Burlap is laid over the slated floor, and the
14	hops are laid on top of the burlap anywhere from 30 to
15	40 inches deep.
16	There's a large burner and fan that blow hot air
17	underneath the kiln floor. Temperature is usually 135
18	to 140 degrees, and the hops are dried for anywhere from
19	eight to 12 hours, depending on the kiln floor depth and
20	the type of hop that you're picking. Those dried hops
21	are then taken off the kiln floor, in most cases
22	mechanically, and cooled for a period of 12 to 24 hours,
23	and then they are put into a press, a hop baler, that
24	bales those bales in a standard-sized bale with burlap,
25	200 pounds.

l We do have growers that take those hops prior -- from 2 the cooling floor and actually have pelletizing 3 facilities where they make pellets right at their facility. But the standard practice is that the hops 5 are baled. 6 The baled hops are then sent to, depending on what the situation is, if they're sold, they go to the buyer. If 7 they're not sold, some growers have -- make the decision 8 that they will process those products further, those hop 9 bales. They'll put them into either pellets or extract. 10 But from the point they're baled is the point where they 11 will ultimately change the raw hop form, and most of the 12 13 dealers have pelletizing facilities and extraction 14 facilities where the hops are pelletized and or extracted. The extract -- the pelletizing process is 15 16 basically where you take the hops and you send them 17 through a dye and you make pellets just like rabbit feed pellets. 18 19 Extract, it's kind of a washing process where you're actually washing out the resins out of the hops. 20 21 Depending on the type of extraction it can be from a yucky black to a beautiful green color, depending on 22 what type of extraction you use. But that extraction is 23 -- are the resins, the lupulin, which is the yellow 24 section of the cone itself. Those extraction resins 25 York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	then can be blended, reduced, changed to meet
2	specifications when it comes to selling the product to
3	the brewery.
4	Also, raw hops can go directly to the brewery
5	in the bale form, and there are breweries that request
6	that the hops be pelletized. There's a concentrated
7	pellet and a standard pellet. Standard pellet just is
8	goes through as such. A concentrated pellet, some of
9	the vegetable material is take away so you have a more
10	concentrated, less vegetable material and more resin
11	material.
12	And those products are then the products that
13	the end user, the brewery uses depending on, as I think
14	you heard earlier, depending on formulas that the
15	breweries have and have much bittering unit, how much
16	this and that, and there's other flavoring components
17	other than just the bittering value in hops. So
18	depending on what the brewery wants, they may add hops
19	for not just for the bittering aspect but for to
20	impart a different aroma or different bouquet off of the
21	final product.
22	Q. So the grower is responsible in most
23	cases. He up to the baling of the hops, before he
24	loses control of the hops or sells them or gives them to
25	his handler?

1	A. Tes. When and It was spoken to a
2	little earlier. There's a grower number that has to go
3	on every bale so it can be tracked, and then the
4	individual growers, depending on how many bales they
5	grow, will divide them into specific lots. The state,
6	you have to have a grower number on there so the state
7	can inspect them for leaf and stem, and it also allows
8	for the ability to know what crop year those hops were
9	grown in.
10	Q. So hops are inspected?
11	A. Yes, they are.
12	Q. Is it a Federal inspection?
13	A. State inspection for leaf and stem, and
14	also you can request a brewing value analysis to be done
15	on those hops, which will give you and it'll give you
16	an alpha acid percentage, it will give you a beta acid
17	percentage, and it'll give you a brewing value
18	calculation, the total brewing value, and you can also
19	get a moisture reading also on those hops if you wish.
20	But we are paid in many cases a premium for the lower
21	leaf and stem, so you have to have some kind of an
22	impartial third person to verify that.
23	Q. And are growers generally paid on the
24	basis of their bales, the number of bales?
25	A. Traditionally hops have been sold on the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	pound of hops. Now they're sold on the pound of hops,
2	they're sold on the pound of alpha, they're sold on the
3	kilo of alpha. So there's a large, you know, area of
4	how actual sales are made now, but traditionally, the
5	traditional grower sells so much per pound of raw hops.

- Q. Would it be safe to say that in the definition of hops and hop products that loose-packaged or baled would be still considered hops, and then when it's pellets, powders, oils, and extracts, you look at it as alpha acid?
- A. Well, I think if you're asking me, it's -- which you are, I think that you have baled hops and pellets packaged, and I think maybe I should explain the package trade. It's -- it used to be a relatively large trade, but it -- and it went to the craft breweries, and what it was was these little tiny packets that were about 2, 3 inches square that were pressed so hard it was like a brick. Usually it was pretty, how should I say nasty old hops. They didn't smell very good either, but -- and they sent them to the home brewing trade. And so when you see that package, that's what that refers to. Loose hops, you know, there's some trade in that, but -- so I would say loose hops, packaged hop, baled hops, and pellets are basically in the raw form, because even with pellets it's actually that raw form.

You take the oils and extracts and those type of things.

- Then you've moved into the process form.
- Q. And I would assume that when they're in pellets, powders, oils, and extracts they're in a more
- 5 storable form. They may have longer shelf lives than
- 6 the -- just baled hops?
- 7 A. Yes. They -- baled hops for the most
- 8 part, depending, again, on variety, there are varieties
- 9 out there that deteriorate very fast and very quickly
- 10 and need to be extracted almost immediately. There are
- 11 other varieties that last a long time. So it depends on
- 12 what variety, but the more stable form you put that
- 13 product in and then that starts, you know, the bale is
- more stable than the raw, the loose hops. Pellets are
- 15 more stable because they're put in packaging that slows
- down the oxidation, and oxidation is what is the big
- 17 problem with hop storageability. So any time you can
- 18 put it into a form that cuts oxidation, you've cut down
- 19 the deterioration of the hop. So pellets would be the
- 20 next phase and then, of course, the best phase would be
- 21 in an extract form where it's, in fact, in a sealed drum
- 22 with no, virtually no oxidation.
- Q. Can you give some general timeframes of
- the shelf life, say of pellets?
- 25 A. Well, you know, I'm not an expect in that York Stenographic Services, Inc.

- but if pellets are in the right form, you know, they can
 last a few years. Extract can last much longer.
- Q. So extract can last longer than a couple of years?
- 5 A. Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Thank you. That's -- I really appreciate that information.
- A. You're welcome.
- Now, on Section B, paragraph B of that, 9 10 you said that that's where it's discussing alpha acid, hops, and aroma hops. You said that's in there for 11 informational purposes only. Are the terms aroma hops 12 13 and high-alpha hops to your knowledge used throughout 14 the order at all, through the proposed order? Or is it 15 just discussed in -- on the basis of a percentage of 16 alpha?
 - A. You know, I don't think it's used in any capacity in any other area. I think what happened when this was -- the original draft of the first proposal included a separation of alpha hops and aroma hops. And so we had to make -- there had to be a determination and an explanation of what alpha hops were, alpha acid hops and or high-alpha hops and aroma hops, and what they did, this was left in there. It doesn't affect anything other than it tells you when -- gives you the

l	information that when we're talking about alpha acid
2	hops what those are used for and aroma hops, what
3	they're used for. But originally it had to do with the
4	separation of the two types of hop.
5	Q. Okay. Under production area I know that
6	this was touched on some yesterday, but I was wondering
7	if you could speak to why California was included in the
8	production area.
9	A. Well, there, to my knowledge there is a
10	limited production down there, but even more important
11	there is the infrastructure down there. It has been in
12	the past few years a viable hop-growing area. It has
13	the ability to be a viable hop-growing area again,
14	because, as I said, the infrastructure is still there.
15	There's still building down there. There's still piles
16	of hop poles down there and so forth.
17	So to not include that, given the fact that it
18	has been and very likely could be expanded, would
19	just doesn't seem to be reasonable.
20	Q. Do you know how many growers there are
21	there now?
22	A. I think there's one.
23	Q. Is he or she, is he or she familiar with
24	does he know that there is a potential marketing
25	order?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. Yes, I think that he's on the opponent's
2	side. He was one of the yeah. The opponents. He
3	was one of the members of the original Hop Marketing
4	Order.
5	* * *
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Let's
7	change the tape at 11:13.
8	* * *
9	[Tape 2 Side 2]
10	* * *
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We're
12	back on record at 11:14. Ms. Finn.
13	MS. FINN: Thank you.
14	***
15	BY MS. FINN:
16	Q. If I could now move to the definition of
17	producer, do you think at some that perhaps if a
18	marketing order is implemented and a committee is set up
19	that the group would be interested in setting forth some
20	more specific parameters on the voting requirements and
21	eligibility for voting?
22	A. You know, I think the committee would
23	definitely be open to that suggestion. We've worked on
24	it so long it's pretty clear to us, you know, I mean,
25	but it's if it can be cleaned up some, I don't think
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	that and I'm speaking just strictly for me, but I
2	don't think the committee would have a problem with
3	that, because we know what the intent of these
4	provisions are, and if it doesn't quite get there, then
5	we would be open to tightening it up.
6	Q. And did you consider putting a proviso in
7	there that said rules and regulations could be
8	recommended by the committee and approved by the
9	Secretary to further clarify this information?
10	A. That could be done. I mean, we never
11	we didn't think about that part of it or we might
12	have put it in. So, but I mean, that's a good
13	suggestion, and I think the committee would be willing
14	to address that.
15	Q. Just for the record what is common
16	banking?
17	A. My interpretation of common banking is
18	that if you have a situation where you have a father and
19	a son, and the son and the father the son is farming
20	but his, all of his financing and all of his banking is
21	part of the whole operation and coming from a line
22	that's set up specifically for the overall operation,
23	then it's not a separate banking situation. It's common
24	banking. It's basically one grower entity. And that's
25	just one of the criteria, because that does happen, and York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	again, in the Mint Marketing Order they have specific
2	criteria so that if you want to become a new grower you
3	can't just say I'm a new grower. I can't just say my
4	son, Jason's, going to be a new grower so he wants base,
5	and then I own the land, I farm the land, I have the
6	equipment, I don't charge him anything, I do all the
7	financing, and really all it is is kind of a cover for
8	my operation. That's what this is intended to cover.
9	Q. Are there reasons other than the
10	eligibility to vote for committee membership that a
11	producer might want to segregate his business entities
12	and have separate business entities for separate
13	purposes?
14	A. Yes. There could be, and I don't think
15	we have any problem with that. That's not the issue. A
16	grower can have as many entities depending on his
17	business and how he has it set up. We're not I don't
18	think the committee is trying to say that you can't have
19	multiple entities. What we're saying is it's not fair
20	to have multiple entities and be able to utilize those
21	multiple entities when you control all of them to gain
22	voting power.
23	So there's no question you can have, and there's
24	advantages to having multiple entities in certain

business situations.

25

I	Q. All right. If I can move to the
2	definition of handle now, I'm not sure where to start.
3	Hold on one sec. Are there brewers, well, can brewers
4	are there brewers that are producers?
5	A. Well, I would say, and, again, I don't
6	know the particulars. Just from what I understand there
7	is a situation where a brewer has a subsidiary or some
8	arm of their overall operation that is a farm, a hop
9	farm.
10	Q. Are there brewers that have processing
11	facilities within the production area?
12	A. Domestic brewers or foreign brewers?
13	Q. Well, domestic brewers.
14	A. I'm not aware of any domestic brewer that
15	has a processing facility in the growing area.
16	Q. Now, you said there are, I'm guessing
17	like four major handlers. Well, two major handlers and
18	maybe two smaller handlers that you know of. I'm trying
19	to get a sense of how many other handlers there will be
20	in total, and you said some producers who, producers who
21	transport their hops outside the production area say to
22	a foreign brewer, they would become the handler.
23	A. Well
24	Q. Is that correct?
25	Aif you're asking for a number, I would
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	say potentially you would have the potential for the
2	same number of handlers as we have growers. So if you
3	have 50 or 60 growers, you may you could have 50 or
4	60 additional handlers because the way it's set up, if ${\tt I}$
5	sell directly to a brewery, I am the handler,
6	irregardless of whether it's domestic or export. I
7	become the handler. I may sell all the rest of my hops
8	to a handler as a producer. Then I'm a producer. I
9	sell them to that handler. That handler is the handler.
10	I'm still I'm just the producer, but whenever I sell
11	directly to a brewer, I become the handler, and I'm
12	responsible for the reporting and everything else that
13	goes along with it.
14	Q. Do you know if the producer, these
15	producers know that if this marketing order is
16	implemented that they will be considered handlers and
17	subject to the regulations under the order?
18	A. Do I know that everybody is aware of it?
19	I think that the majority of the industry is. I think
20	that there's many, many in the industry that are
21	operating as handlers right now in more sense than just
22	selling to the dealers. There are people that sell to
23	or, you know, to breweries and have their own
24	business. So I would think that a number of them
25	definitely would, but I can't say that everybody truly
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
1
       understands this part of it.
2
                       So potentially the majority of the
3
       producers could also be considered handlers.
4
                       Well, I don't know whether it would be a
       majority or not, because I don't know how many growers
5
       actually fall under that category. All -- the growers
6
       who sell as a producer to a handler would not fall under
7
8
       that category. It's the only one -- it would be, the
       only ones that would fall under that category would be
9
10
       the ones that sell directly to the brewery. They become
11
       the handler.
12
                                    * * *
                  MS. FINN: I think that's all I have.
13
14
       you.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.
15
16
               Yes. Mr. Broadbent. Thank you. Mr. Olson.
                                    * * *
17
18
       BY MR. OLSON:
                       With regards to hops and hops products,
19
                  Q.
        do all hops have alpha acid?
20
21
                       Sometimes when you deliver them the
22
        dealers say they don't, but for the most part I think
23
        they, yes, they would.
24
                       You had mentioned that the early
        proposal, had an early proposal in which alpha and aroma
25
                          York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

I had been separated. What was the rationale about
2 dropping that?

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, in the beginning there were many, many suggestions. Some suggestions were to eliminate the aroma side completely, and those were discussed, and there were numerous pitfalls to doing that and quite a concern in the grower community that that could create a real problem for the aroma grower in a two-fold situation. Number one, if the alpha acid side got into balance, that the alpha acid growers would cannibalize the aroma growers. The other side of the coin was that the alpha acid growers could -- or the aroma growers could, in fact, be growing aroma, have a relationship, and then for whatever reason, and that relationship be with a brewery, and for whatever reason tastes change, demands change, and all of sudden that customer they have a relationship with decides to change to an alpha acid hop. That grower would be totally froze out of doing anything, because they couldn't switch, other than to have to go out and buy into the alpha side. So that didn't work. And then we talked about two base allotment systems, where, in fact, it would be a similar situation to the Mint Marketing Order, where we had -- mint has a native and a scotch, and so we would have an alpha side and an aroma side, and we would set a York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	salable on each one and but then it came down to, well,
2	people wanted to have some kind of a formula to switch
3	back and forth. And then if you switched one way, you
4	would lose allotment. If you switched the other way,
5	you gained it, and quite frankly it was an absolute
6	nightmare to try to figure out. And ultimately it
7	didn't get us to the to what we really wanted to
8	control.
9	And so then the next thing that came along was this
10	proposal, and I can tell you, I was an advocate in the
11	very beginning of a two-base proposal. I just said
12	that's the only way it can work. It's the only way that
13	makes sense, and after considerable discussion and
14	figuring out all of the pros and the cons it became very
15	apparent to me that that just didn't work, because it
16	didn't allow for the free market to work underneath the
17	marketing order, and I think that you'll probably hear
18	more about that later. But this marketing order, one of
19	the goals we tried to achieve is, yes, there's
20	regulation. There is regulation, but to allow as much
21	individual grower flexibility underneath that umbrella,
22	so that growers can make the decision of what they grow,
23	how much they grow under that umbrella, and what they
24	sell it for. And they can make the determination of
25	whether they want to move to alpha hops or to aroma
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	14 N

	623
1	hops.
2	So when all of this came out, it just and we asked
3	for other suggestions from the trade, and nobody could
4	come up with a better solution to this situation other
5	than to figure out an equitable way to start it, and
6	then to allow the industry to operate freely underneath
7	that with regards to whether it was alpha or aroma.
8	Q. Are alpha and aroma hops substitutes in
9	the market place?
10	A. Yes and no. And the reason I say that is
11	because at the end of the day they all have a bittering
12	value. They all impart bitterness in the final product,
13	and I'm not a brewer, so there may be brewers out there
14	that will contradict, but from my experience in the
15	business whether you use aroma hops or alpha hops, alpha
16	acid hops in your formula, they each impart a certain
17	amount of bitterness, because they do have alpha acid,
18	even the aroma hops have some alpha acid.
19	So what you're talking about is coming up with a

So what you're talking about is coming up with a combination of bitter hops and aroma hops that the total bitterness of the two is what you want, and the aroma characteristic, which imparts the bouquet, the flavor, all of the things other than the bitterness, you know. If you smell beer, some beers smell better than others or worse than others, you know, or different, I guess. York Stenographic Services, Inc.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	Not better or worse but different, unless you have a
2	skunky one, then it smells bad. But so you have this
3	ability to manipulate the formula, but ultimately at the
4	end of the day it's the amount of bittering hops that
5	take place or really are the critical issues.
6	So, yes, they are not interchangeable from the
7	standpoint you don't use a bitter hop to give you, let's
8	say, the bouquet that a cascade hop would. But that
9	cascade hop or that Willamette will, in fact, put
10	bitterness in your product.
11	So they do kind of intertwine.
12	Q. Okay. One last question. Lupulin
13	A. Lupulin.
14	Q. Under the definition you have loose,
15	packaged, baled, and pellets, and you've previously said
16	that that is the raw form. Powder, oils, and extracts
17	would be processed form. Where does lupulin, sorry
18	A. Yeah. Lupulin.
19	Qthat L word.
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Where does that fit in in this
22	definition, and is it in a form that could be traded to
23	anybody who sold, bought, whatever? Where does that fit
24	into this definition with those other forms of hops?
25	A. Well, I think the reason that that's
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	included in there is that you can actually shake the
2	lupulin out of the raw product. You see it in picking
3	facilities when you're picking, when you're drying.
4	Lupulin does get knocked out of the cone itself. It can
5	be a beautiful yellow resin type material that's laying
6	on the floor or underneath a conveyor, or it can be
7	caked up on your belts, and it can but it's the pure
8	lupulin which has the resins and the alpha acid in it,
9	and it can be utilized in added in to be extract
10	the product or whatever.
11	So I don't know how much of that happens, but it's one
12	of those things that cover them all just in case,
13	because really what you're doing in some of these
14	concentrated pellets you're actually shaking out the
15	lupulin and taking away more of the vegetative matters,
16	so you're actually in a way doing that to a degree.
17	So
18	Q. Thank you. Moving to handle, 991.08, it
19	says, "To prepare hops for market." Could you expand on
20	that a little bit?
21	A. That would be to put it in a form that it
22	would go to the end user. Could be pelletizing,
23	extraction, recompressed bale. It could be any of those
24	things.
25	Q. Would baling on the farm operation be
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

i	considered preparing for market?
2	A. No, it would not.
3	***
4	MR. OLSEN: That's it. Thanks.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
6	Broadbent [sic]. Ms. Finn.
7	MS. FINN: I'm sorry. I forgot to ask I
8	had a couple of questions about your definition of new
9	producer.
10	MR. GASSELING: That's actually the
11	Government's definition. Sorry.
12	***
13	BY MS. FINN:
14	Q. Was this put in here because there were
15	concerns that there would be some growers in the
16	industry if this marketing order were implemented and
17	that would not have an opportunity to obtain base?
18	A. That was the concern of the Department.
19	I think by Mr. Weilmunster's testimony, he's the newest
20	and latest grower, and he was a 2000, grower or 2002,
21	grower, so it we didn't think it was as much an
22	issue, but there was the concern on the Department's
23	side that there could be a grower come in in 2003,
24	produce hops, and he would not be eligible for a base
25	allotment. So this clause was put in there to take into
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	account the remote possibility that there was a bona
2	fide new producer in 2003, and that producer would, in
3	fact, be eligible for base allotment.
4	Q. Using the date 2003, was that in
5	anticipation of a marketing order being in effect in
6	2004?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. So in the event that a marketing order is
9	not put in place in 2004, but is put in place in say
.0	2005, would you want to add another year to that to
1	cover that
12	A. No.
13	Qgrower?
14	A. No. I think at some point we have to
15	and this is my opinion. I think at some point the
16	more you dilute the process as far as putting specific
17	rules and regulations and expectations out there, it
18	opens it up for potential of exploiting what we're
19	trying to do, and I think the critical thing is that we
20	don't do that. I understand why the Department was
21	adamant about that. I had no problem, because we know
22	that basically there are no new growers. But if you
23	start to say I would entertain doing this another year
24	or two years or whatever, I think you open yourself up
25	for all kinds of potential games that do nothing but

Ţ	actually hurt the industry.
2	Q. So anyone who grew hops in 2004, if an
3	order was implement in 2005, would not be eligible for
4	base?
5	A. Well, the way it reads right now, that's
6	correct. I guess my point would be that my feeling is
7	we're going to we're either going to have an order.
8	This order will either be in effect for next year, or we
9	won't have an order. If that happens that it goes
10	another year, then I guess it comes down to the
11	situation that do we change that 2003, to 2004? Do we
12	leave it the same? Does the Department feel that it
13	would it's beneficial to change it? I think we'd
14	have to cross that bridge when it happens.
15	Q. It says that a person who has previously
16	been granted a hop commission grower number or an
17	allotment base would not be considered a new producer.
18	Would it be possible for a grower to have been assigned
19	a grower number, say ten years, 15 years ago, through
20	down through his family, and still be a new producer
21	in 2003?
22	A. Where which one were you reading?
23	Where were you reading so
24	Q. Oh. The second sentence in that
25	definition. It says the term, "new producer

1	specifically excludes any person who has previously been
2	granted hop commission grower number." I was just
3	wondering if it was possible for somebody to have a
4	grower number and not have grown for years and then
5	decide to grow hops in 2003.
6	A. Well, the way this reads that if they've
7	been given a grower number previously, they're not
8	considered to be a new producer.
9	Q. Okay. Do you know if the order, proposed
10	order is intended to regulate hops or alpha acid?
11	A. Alpha acid.
12	* * *
13	MS. FINN: Okay. Thank you.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Dr. Hinman.
15	DR. HINMAN: One production question.
16	***
17	BY DR. HINMAN:
18	Q. On the we've heard that, previously,
19	that the hops it's a pretty good plan that bears in
20	the first year. Is there a generally-accepted standard
21	by which you say it reaches maximum production? Hops in
22	general. Hops plant.
23	A. I would say that in the State of
24	Washington it's probably the only place in the world
25	that you can actually get a full crop in the first year.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	In the State of Oregon usually it's depending, again, on
2	variety. It's one to two years to get into full
3	production. And I think you heard from Idaho that that
4	same situation seems to prevail there, that it takes at
5	least a year before they can get a year or more
6	before they can get up to full production.
7	And that's the advantage that the whole United States
8	has. In other areas of the world it even takes, you
9	know, it may even take longer.
10	Q. And I have some questions related to the
11	marketing which you described in some detail. Make sure
12	I fully understand the distinctions and categories. You
13	talked about bales, loose hops, pellets, and extract.
14	Can you distinguish a little bit between bales and loose
15	hops?
16	A. Well, there's very few loose hops sold
17	into the trade anymore. There was years and years ago
18	there were outlets for loose hops. There still is some.
19	In fact, I think that they had some fresh hopping
20	festival in Yakima here just recently, and they used
21	fresh loose hops. Green hops and put them in. I guess
22	it was pretty good stuff. But, I mean, that would be a
23	loose hop thing, but it's a very small part of the
24	overall thing. The major areas are bales, pellets,
25	extract, and those products.

1	But it's one of those things that when we wrote this,
2	you want to cover everything, because you never know
3	what might change down the road.
4	Q. You've heard, you know, leaf hops, cones
5	and bales. Is that are they all equivalent? Is tha
6	a bale consists of leaf hops?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Okay. And getting back to the other
9	categories there, a bale is generally one variety. Is
10	that correct or no?
11	A. Well, it's supposed to be. You're
12	supposed to label on the bale what variety it is.
13	Sometimes I don't know, you know, but yes, normally a
14	bale should be one variety, and a lot should be one
15	variety also.
16	Q. And I think pellets and extract can be a
17	blend of varieties. Or is that not
18	A. Well
19	Qthe case, or are they carefully
20	distinguished as well?
21	A. You know, and I haven't been on the
22	dealer side for awhile, so I'm going to just speak from
23	how what my knowledge most processed products,
24	pellets especially, are varietal.
25	Q. Okay.

1	A. Extract, years ago it wasn't so critical
2	because there wasn't the ability to test the product to
3	tell exactly what variety was in the extract. If you
4	wanted 43 percent alpha extract, you got it, and it
5	might be 43 of this or that. Now many of the breweries
6	request specifically a certain type or whatever of
7	extract, and then there are other breweries that just
8	say I want a certain level of alpha acid in the extract
9	and it's generic.
10	Q. And generic meaning a blend of many
11	varieties?
12	A. It could be. Or any variety, just that
13	it be that criteria that I've set.
14	Q. Okay. And getting to and alpha in
15	those terms is the term alpha and bitter equivalent?
16	Alpha hop, bitter hop.
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And using the word, alpha, we have
19	categories, aroma hop, alpha hop. We heard high alpha
20	and heard, at least previously, super-high alpha. Does
21	every variety you say that every variety grown fits
22	uniquely into one of those categories?
23	A. Well, there are some that depending on
24	what the brewery considers it to be, in one case may be
25	a bittering hop, and in other cases it may be an aroma
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	hop to another user, and in some cases it's used as
2	both. It may have characteristics of both and may be
3	used in that fashion to take care of both areas.
4	Q. Using those same categories, is the cost
5	of production fairly similar or fairly distinct between
6	those broad categories? Cost production at the grower
7	level.
8	A. I think on a per-acre basis probably
9	there are some. There is some variations in any given
0	thing, but on a per-acre basis they're probably pretty
11	close. Now, on a per-pound basis it varies
12	substantially.
13	Q. Okay. And the season average goal price
14	that we listed, you know, we submitted earlier is
15	obviously a combination of all of those. Is there in
16	that season average price can you categorize for us
17	which of those categories are higher or lower priced and
18	how and when you compute that average price how that
19	all gets folded into a single price that might be can
20	you give us more, complete information about how those
21	prices might be distinct?
22	A. Well, for the past number of years the
23	aroma varieties have demanded a much higher price than
24	the bitter hops. That basically is attributed to a

major brewer that has made a decision that quality is

25

1	the most important to them, and they have paid a price
2	that has been very acceptable to the growing trade,
3	when, in fact, the rest of the industry, the price, if
4	you compare the prices, they're substantially less. So
5	what happens with the and I should say there are
6	basically two breweries that have really done that. But
7	what happens is then you take a hop that sells for \$3.50
8	a pound, and you take a hop that sells for 50 cents a
9	pound, and you take the average, well, it skews the
10	average so that you're not really getting a true
11	reading. When you look at and say the price of hops are
12	increasing, well, that may be just basically because
13	there's more of the higher-priced hops versus this low
14	end. It's making it move up, but the overall to the
15	grower is a different situation.
16	Q. I want to ask you a question that's been
17	asked of others about, you know, large and small
18	growers. You've heard the Small Business Administration
19	definition of up to \$750,000 in gross sales would be a
20	small, and above that a large grower. Can you answer in
21	terms of your own operation and if you can answer it two
22	ways; one in terms of just hops, in terms of all
23	agricultural products. Are you small or large?
24	A. Under that definition we would be large.
25	Q. In either in just hops alone?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	24 North Coorgo St. Vorte DA 17401 (717) 954 0077

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Okay. Yesterday we heard an estimate of
3	the amount of for the six growers in Idaho, the
4	number that were small and large based on those
5	criteria. Would you be able to proffer an estimate for
6	Washington state growers?
7	A. In total as far as just or just hops?
8	Q. Either way. I guess in terms of hops
9	first. Would you characterize
10	A. Well, this would be, you know, this is,
11	of course, a guess, but I would think that the majority
12	of the growers in the State of Washington would fit into
13	the large category.
14	Q. Just on hops. Okay.
15	***
16	DR. HINMAN: Thank you very much.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ms. Finn.
18	MS. FINN: I just have one clarifying
19	question.
20	***
21	BY MS. FINN:
22	Q. The section 991.13, new producer, was
23	that written by a Government official from USDA, or was
24	that written by a representative from the Proponent's
25	Committee in answer to concerns expressed by Government
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	officials?
2	A. I'll fall on my sword here. It's the one
3	paragraph I wrote in the whole marketing order in
4	response to a stated concern from the USDA.
5	***
6	MS. FINN: Thank you.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ms. Dec.
8	MS. DEC: Your Honor, I was just passing the
9	microphone over.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ms. Deskins.
11	* * *
12	BY MS. DESKINS:
13	Q. I had a question for you about coops.
14	You had said that part of this definition of independent
15	producer that you struck out related to coops, and that
16	aren't currently any coops in the hops industry.
17	A. Not to my knowledge.
18	Q. Do you anticipate any coops coming
19	around?
20	A. No.
21	Q. Okay. The reason I'm just asking is
22	because if a coop should develop, is there any concern
23	in these definitions of defining it so that you don't
24	have a coop dominate the committee?
25	A. There's no wording in the document that
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
1
       specifically addresses coops, so it's not addressed in
2
       there.
3
                       Okay.
                  Q.
4
                  MS. DESKINS: I have no further questions.
5
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.
6
7
       Deskins. Any other questions from the Government
8
       representatives? There are none.
9
                  Any follow-up questions from anyone? Mr.
10
       Moody.
11
                  MR. MOODY: Yes.
12
13
       BY MR. MOODY:
14
                  Q. Mr. Gasseling, thank you. I just want to
15
       touch briefly on that grower becoming handler situation.
       If I understand your operation, you're a producer of
16
17
       hops, and you're contracted to a brewer.
18
                      We are a producer. We do sell hops
       directly to brewers, and we also sell hops directly to
19
20
       the handlers.
21
                       Okay. And those are -- the '03, hops you
                  Q.
22
        sell to brewers are under contract?
23
                       The ones that I have sold to the
24
       breweries?
25
                  Q.
                       Yes, sir.
```

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

i	P	<i>A</i> .	Yes.
2	Ç).	Okay. And that's one of these forward
3	contracts t	hat	other witnesses have testified to?
4	P	Α.	Some of it is.
5	Ç	2.	Okay. You by that you mean you also
6	sell some t	o br	rewers on the spot market?
7	P	<i>4</i> .	Yes. I've sold some direct.
8	Ç	2.	Okay.
9	A	١.	On the spot market.
10	Q).	Okay. So now with respect to the hops
11	that you're	e sel	ling to brewers under either of the
12	contract or	the	spot market, is it your testimony that
13	you are the	e han	dler with respect to those hops?
14	P	١.	The hops that I sell directly to the
15	brewer I wo	ould	be the handler. Yes.
16	Q	2.	Okay. And that's it doesn't make any
17	difference	whet	her it's a forward contract or on the
18	spot market	?	
19	P	١.	I don't see where why it would make
20	any differe	ence.	••
21	Ç	2.	Okay.
22	מָ	Α.	if I sell them whether they're spot
23	hops or con	ntrac	ted hops to the end user. At the time I
24	sell spot h	nops,	they actually become contracted hops.
25	So it's the	e sam	ne.
			•• • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Q. Okay. And is this in your
2	negotiations with the growers over the last three years,
3	is were growers advised that with respect to their
4	direct to brewer sales that they would become handlers?
5	A. Well, I think the discussion has taken
6	place, but I think what's happened is it's become
7	evident because of the situation with regards to taking
8	care of foreign purchasers as well as the craft brewing
9	trade that the most efficient way to handle it is the
10	way we've done it, because we're talking about
11	potentially up to 50 or 60 potential handlers if every
12	grower sold direct versus if we made the end user, the
13	brewer, as been testified here, up to maybe 900, would
14	be just it would be such a problem that from keeping
15	track of it that it just doesn't make any sense.
16	Q. Okay. So potentially then to the extent
17	that every grower in the industry had direct sales to
18	brewers, then every grower in the industry could be
19	treated as a would be regarded as a handler.
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Okay. And are you aware of and did you
22	discuss with growers in formulating the order that under
23	608C14 of the Act that by becoming a handler you become
24	liable for criminal penalties of up to \$5,000 each day
25	for any violation of the marketing order, including
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	paperwork and record keeping violations?
2	A. Am I aware of that?
3	Q. Yes, sir.
4	A. Yes, I am.
5	Q. And did you advise growers in your
6	discussions leading up to the order that that was
7	something they'd be facing?
8	A. I don't specifically recall that in that
9	context, but there has been discussion about that you
10	would have to be accountable as a handler for the record
11	keeping, and there were penalties if you didn't adhere
12	to the rules.
13	Q. Okay. And in addition to the criminal
14	fines and penalties for each day, are you also aware
15	yourself and did you advise growers that they'd be
16	subject under 608C14B of the Act to civil penalties of
17	up to \$1,000 for a day during each day that there's a
18	violation of any provision of the marketing order,
19	including the record keeping and report provisions?
20	A. Well, I'm not going to venture to say
21	that I've quoted every one of those statutes to the
22	growers. I guess my comment would be that it's worked
23	before. The committee has the, I think, the flexibility
24	to address compliance or non-compliance, and if a grower
25	who was acting as a handler did not comply, he should be York Stenographic Services, Inc.

l	subject to the same penalties that a handler, so-called
2	strictly handler would have. It's the same scenario.
3	So I guess that I would say that they have to be subject
4	to make sure that the reporting and the and
5	everything is taken care of.
6	***
7	MR. MOODY: Thank you, Mr. Gasseling.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Let's
9	change the tape. It's now 11:58.
10	***
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We're
12	back on record at 12:10. We took care of some other
13	matters besides changing the tape. Are there any other
14	questions for Mr. Gasseling?
15	***
16	BY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
17	Q. Mr. Gasseling, I have a question with
18	regard to the production area, Section 991.05. If
19	District 3 were eliminated and only Washington and
20	Oregon growers were subject to the proposed marketing
21	order, would you still be in favor of it being
22	promulgated?
23	A. Let's say I would be less in favor of it,
24	because I think it still comes down to the basic
25	scenario that these are viable areas that hops can be
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	24 North Coargo St. Vorle DA 17401 (717) 954 0077

1	grown in. There is infrastructure there, and history of
2	the Mint Order showed that a person was able to go to
3	another state and in this case I don't even know if mint
4	was grown but grow a substantial amount of product and
5	cause a problem for the production areas. So I would
6	feel that given the history of hop production in the
7	northwest, that these four states need to be included.
8	And I've heard the comment that, well, why not New York?
9	They used to grow them, too, and my answer is that
10	there's no infrastructure there to do that. It would
11	take a tremendous amount of investment to do that, and
12	they haven't been growing a long time. There's no
13	history of those varieties being able to be grown,
14	today's varieties, but we do have a history in these
15	states. And so I think it's necessary for the operation
16	that they all be included.
17	Q. Of the states that are mentioned;
18	Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California, which state
19	is are which the California growers are closest
20	to which of the other states?
21	A. I'm trying to figure out. If you go
22	north, that's into Idaho, isn't it? I don't know. You
23	know, I mean, it's they're grown around the
24	Sacramento Valley.
25	Q. Oh, my goodness.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	A. Of California.
2	Q. They're distant from every single one of
3	the other marketing areas
4	A. Yes.
5	Qaren't they?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Now, the Washington and the Oregon
8	marketing areas, who distant are they from each other?
9	A. Washington is in the Yakima Valley, and Oregon is
10	in the Willamette Valley.
11	Q. So a three-hour drive, four-hour drive
12	perhaps?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Now, do you have any idea how distant the
15	northern Idaho grower is from the other growers who are
16	apparently all in southern Idaho?
17	A. I think it's a couple, three hours from
18	the Treasure Valley to the Canadian border. Five I' π
19	getting some signals out there.
20	Q. At what speed?
21	A. At some speed it's probably that, but it
22	may be more than that. I used to drive it when I lived
23	in Idaho, but I can't really remember. It's probably
24	more than three hours. It could be four or five hours,
25	because it's in the very northern tip of Idaho and the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	7 A N L + 1 / C + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 +

1	Treasure Valley is in the southern part.
2	Q. So those that Idaho grower, I guess
3	there's only one, is really quite distant from the
4	growers in Washington, the growers in Oregon, the other
5	growers in southern Idaho I believe.
6	A. Yeah. They're pretty distant.
7	Q. Okay.
8	A. In more ways than one.
9	Q. All right. From your personal contact
10	with the growers in Oregon, what is the majority of
11	attitude there toward this proposal?
12	A. Well, my opinion is that there is a
13	majority who favor some kind of control on this market
14	in Oregon.
15	Q. And do you think a marketing order is the
16	kind of control that they envision?
17	A. Well, again, it goes back to the fact
18	that when this first process first started it was
19	consensus of the whole industry with possibly the
20	exception of Idaho that a mandatory program had to be
21	put into effect. And at the convention the consensus
22	was to start the process for a Federal marketing order.
23	So I think everybody was well aware that that's what was
24	going to be pursued, and that's the way the industry
25	wanted to go.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Now, we, you know, we can discuss at length whether it's
2	a big majority, small majority, majority or not. The
3	Proponent's Committee has put together a program, and
4	our real goal in this whole thing is to put together a
5	program we felt was fair and allow the growers to make
6	that final determination. If they determine it's not
7	what they want, then so be it. If they do, then we go
8	forward.
9	But out goal was to get this process to this point and
10	then to the next point of a referendum, because we are
11	the growers, and we are the people that are going to
12	either benefit or suffer or a combination with whatever
13	comes out of this. So I think we just wanted to get
14	this thing to a vote and let the growers determine it.
15	***
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you very
17	much, Mr. Gasseling. Anything else you'd like to add
18	about any topic?
19	MR. GASSELING: I think I've done about all I
20	can.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
22	you. You've been an excellent witness. I appreciate
23	it.
24	MR. GASSELING: Thank you.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Now, would you give
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	back to the court reporter that which Mr. Monahan
2	borrowed from him.
3	MR. MONAHAN: Exhibit 10.
4	MR. GASSELING: Yeah. I'm trying there it
5	is.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. All
7	right. Mr. Carswell, you may call your witness now.
8	MR. CARSWELL: Thank you, Your Honor. I'd
9	like to call Mr. Don Kloth, K-l-o-t-h, and what I'd like
10	to do, Your Honor, is ask him a few questions to set
il	forth his background, and then he has some comments that
12	he would like to make, and then I would like to ask him
13	a few questions on direct examination.
14	As I mentioned yesterday, his comments really
15	are notes that he drafted that have been typed up, but
16	since everybody else has pretty much shared their
17	statement, I'm going to go ahead, and I've got copies
18	for the folks that have been getting copies of his
19	comments, and I'll pass those out now.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes, please. We'll
21	go off record while you do that.
22	***
23	[Off the record]
24	[On the record]
25	* * *

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're on record now
2	at 12:20. Mr. Kloth, would you state and spell your
3	full name for the record?
4	DR. KLOTH: My name is Donald W. Kloth. First
5	name, D-o-n-a-l-d, middle initial W, last name
6	K-1-o-t-h.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. And
8	I've handed the court reporter what's been marked as
9	Exhibit 22. Is that a copy of your prepared statement?
10	DR. KLOTH: Yes, it is.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Mr.
12	Carswell, you may examine oh, Mr. Kloth, would you
13	raise your right hand? I'll put you under oath.
14	***
15	[Witness sworn]
16	* * *
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Mr.
18	Carswell.
19	MR. CARSWELL: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	***
21	DONALD W. KLOTH,
22	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
23	testified as follows:
24	BY MR. CARSWELL:
25	Q. Mr. Kloth, if you wouldn't mind, if you
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	could state your title at Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc.
2	A. Vice-president and group executive.
3	Q. Could you describe your responsibilities
4	at Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc.?
5	A. I am chairman and CEO of Busch
6	Agricultural Resources, which is an agricultural
7	subsidiary of Anheuser-Busch. The raw materials
8	procurement organization reports into my office. The
9	corporate purchasing organization reports into my
10	office. Some of our transportation functions report
li	into my office, as well as a few other miscellaneous
12	responsibilities.
13	Q. So as part of your area of responsibility
14	you're ultimately responsible for the hop purchasing
15	decisions made by the company. Is that correct?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. How long have you been at Anheuser-Busch?
18	A. Thirty-three years.
19	Q. If you wouldn't mind, if you could also
20	give us a little background on your educational history,
21	beginning with your undergraduate degree.
22	A. I have a BS and MS degree from Southern
23	Illinois in agricultural industries. I have a Ph.D.
24	from Oklahoma State in agricultural economics.
25	Q. Are you also a farmer?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	A. I was a farmer at one point in time. I
2	am now just a land owner, which is a productive farm by
3	the way.
4	Q. Mr. Kloth, I believe you have some
5	comments and then if you don't mind, I'm going to ask
6	you a few questions after you've completed. Thank you.
7	A. Okay. Judge Clifton, Ms. Deskins, and
8	other representatives of the USDA, growers, other
9	participants, thank you for the opportunity to testify
10	at this hearing where we're considering whether to issue
11	a Hop Marketing Order.
12	And Your Honor, I'd like to refer to the Hop Marketing
13	Order as HMO in my the rest of my comments.
14	The proposed HMO would primarily consist of volume
15	control measures in the farm of grower allotments of
16	saleable hop alpha. As you have seen in the comments
17	submitted prior to these hearings and as I believe you
18	will see during the course of these proceedings, many
19	other growers, as well as other interested parties such
20	as brewers and handlers, are opposed to the proposed
21	order.
22	Anheuser-Busch is the world's largest brewer. We
23	operate 14 breweries, 12 of which are located in the US.
24	We are also the largest purchaser of hops in the US. We
25	purchase approximately 16 percent of the total US hop
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	production, and for these reasons we have a vital
2	interest in a thriving, vibrant US hop industry, an
3	industry that encourages private farmers to respond
4	freely to market signals and rewards them economically
5	for doing so.
6	Moreover, as a significant grower of hops at our farm in
7	Bonners Ferry, Idaho, we have an understanding of the
8	economics of hop growing, as well as the issues facing
9	hop producers today, a perspective that many of the
10	other brewers probably would not have.
11	We have studied the proposed HMO and present hop
12	marketing conditions long and hard, and our examination
13	lead us to tell you that we truly believe that the
14	proposed HMO under current economic conditions will only
15	damage most US hop growers. And it will likely benefit
16	foreign producers such as the Germans, the East
17	Europeans, and the Chinese.
18	I'd like to make my comments regarding five basic
19	points. The first point is the Hop Marketing Order is
20	designed to increase price by affecting US supply by
21	farming a cartel. Anheuser-Busch, however, has
22	historically offered multi-year aroma hop contracts.
23	These contracts were good and profitable for the
24	growers. They offered fair returns, and they also
25	offered a planning horizon so that you could plan your
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	operations.
2	These contracts were also good for Anheuser-Busch. They
3	gave us supply assurance, gave us our varietal
4	preference, met our quality standards at a cost that we
5	felt that we could live with.
6	Our contract program formed a supply, demand equilibrium
7	that benefited both the grower as well as the customer.
8	The problem with the US hop industry is not alpha hops.
9	Let me rephrase that. I misspoke.
10	The problem with the US hop industry is not aroma hops.
11	It's the high-alpha hop that's the problem, and you will
12	not solve the high-alpha hop problem with a marketing
13	order. Keep in mind that hops move in a global market.
14	The rest of the world produces 70 plus percent of the
15	hops produced and will not be in a Hop Marketing Order,
16	nor will they have any type of supply controls. Foreign
17	producers will view a US Hop Marketing Order as a signal
18	to increase production. I think this will limit US hop
19	producers with respect to their goals in terms of their
20	pricing goals on high-alpha hops.
21	As I would like to make a concluding comment about this
22	point one, as it relates to high-alpha hops, under a
23	marketing order foreign competition will force a
24	downward spiral of eroding US market share and vanishing
25	profitability for US producers. On the aroma side,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	since it is our understanding that 95 percent of aroma
2	hops are contracted, this acreage will be forced to
3	absorb higher costs. Those costs being the additional
4	costs to purchase additional saleable allotment, plus
5	fixed cost spread over fewer pounds of production.
6	This will be lead to forcing a higher price or
7	driving your customers to foreign sources.
8	My second point revolves around the previous marketing
9	orders which have failed. They have failed when markets
10	have changed, when supply controls misjudged demand, and
11	they created additional costs of production for the
12	grower when the producers were forced to buy allotments
13	to increase production.
14	As a concluding comment on this point, producers and
15	consumers responding to prices set by market supply and
16	demand in a free enterprise environment have succeeded.
17	Government control of any business is not the way
18	America was built, and past Hop Marketing Orders have
19	categorically failed. Instead of constraints the
20	industry needs to work on technology, cost
21	effectiveness, improved market outlook, and long-term
22	contracts.
23	My third point. Under normal circumstances Anheuser-
24	Busch could self-protect its supply needs by growing
25	more hops ourselves, but under the order we could be
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
25	own decisions on what to grow and how much to grow.
24	production decisions and should be free to make their
23	businessmen and women who are best equipped to make
22	management simply does not work. Growers are individual
21	My concluding comment on this point, central committee
20	over-optimism, misjudges the marketplace?
19	committee, because of inaccurate forecasting or
18	consist of eight growers. What happens if this
17	Point number four. Central committee management will
16	insufficient.
15	and expansion of existing operations is totally
14	increase allowed in the proposed HMO for new entrants
13	In addition, the 1 percent annual saleable allotment
12	unfair.
11	existing operation for our own brewing use is grossly
10	potentially forced to cut back production of our
9	grow a portion of our hop requirements. To be
8	1980s Anheuser-Busch invested significant capital to
7	My concluding comment on point three is in the late
6	situation.
5	demand conditions that are reflected in the world
4	going to take a significant cutback to meet the supply,
3	allotment under the proposed HMO, we think that it's
2	given our view of the drastic cut needed and saleable
1	forced to cut back production of our own hops. And

ŀ	My fifth point. Value creation of saleable allotments.
2	We believe that many of the proponents of this HMO
3	simply view the HMO as a way to exit the industry and
4	receive artificially-created value while doing so. We
5	believe that this will place intolerable burden on the
6	remaining growers who presently grow all of the majority
7	of their hops on contracts.
8	My concluding comment on this point. No
9	Government-sponsored program should be created that
10	leads to the artificial creation of value.
11	I would now like to respond to some additional points,
12	four of them, that the Proponents initially set forth as
13	the basis for implementing the HMO.
14	Point one. The Proponents have argued that an HMO would
15	increase long-term contracting. In fact, we believe
16	based on our own experience that an HMO would have the
17	opposite effect. In the 1980s Anheuser-Busch began a
18	direct-to-grower program, under which we began to make
19	substantial purchases directly from growers. During the
20	past decade direct purchases in the farm, multi-year,
21	and forward contracts have come to fulfill a substantial
22	majority of our US hop requirements.
23	Our reasons for initiating the direct-to-grower program
24	included our desire to establish long-term relationship
25	with growers that have efficient operations and that are
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	prepared to make investments in growing the varieties we
2	require subject to our quality control standards.
3	The proposed HMO would create an environment that would
4	challenge our ability to continue to achieve the
5	objective of long-term relationships with efficient US
6	growers. Under an HMO Anheuser-Busch has no incentive
7	to offer multi-year contracts. We have no assurances
8	that US hop sources will be competitive with alternative
9	sources.
10	Since our current long-term contracts expire with the
11	2003, crop, we are prepared to maintain our aroma hop
12	contract volume by offering new, three-year contracts.
13	However, we will wait to see the final outcome of the
14	proposed HMO before we move forward. There are just too
15	many variables and factors to take into consideration to
16	move forward at this time.
17	Point two. US growers have acted independently, are
18	acting independently, failed to limit production which
19	justifies a central planning mechanism. That has been
20	one of their statements.
21	Again, central planning committees don't work. Many
22	growers read the market signals correctly. They entered
23	long-term contracts, and they gained a fair return.
24	Point three. The Proponents have said that the
25	availability of more accurate information will aid the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	central committee to wisery monitor the supply of nops.
2	Free market forces aided by the every-increasing
3	accurate information available to growers that
4	Proponents have identified will always result in better
5	decision making than any centralized planning committee.
6	In this case the central committee would be made up of
7	eight growers who would be very unlikely to have enough
8	market information or vision to make any better
9	decisions than the marketplace.
10	Point four. I have stated that the lack of previously
11	common German crop failures have not materialized to fix
12	the problem of oversupply. Production plans based on
13	the potential demise of a competitor's ability to supply
14	is risky.
15	However, we currently have a German hop crop which is
16	reportedly to be down about 40 percent. The point being
17	that crop shortages still occur, and prices will adjust
18	accordingly.
19	From a policy perspective it is undisputed that the
20	proposed order would once again establish a
21	Government-mandated hop cartel, albeit we feel an
22	unsuccessful one, which could run counter to the Bush
23	administration's recently-stated agricultural policy
24	that recognizes that, and I quote, "The marketplace is
25	the best guide for allocating resources and provides the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	most effective reward for efficiency and good
2	management."
3	The proposed order would also contravene America's
4	international trade policy agenda. The US has long
5	advocated that its trade partners such as the European
6	Union move away from the Government subsidy and quota
7	programs of the past and allow the free market system to
8	ensure that supplies meets demand. For the US to adopt
9	domestically the same policies that it is condemning
10	internationally would significantly undermine both our
i 1	credibility as well our international negotiating
12	position.
13	It would be particularly ironic to give the EU an
14	example of American Government intervention to use
15	against the US while the US hop production moves to EU
16	growers.
17	In conclusion, Anheuser-Busch believes that free
18	enterprise and free trade are the only ways to allocate
19	resources efficiently. They are the cornerstones of our
20	way of life, and they are the prevailing policies of the
21	present administration. They are also the best remedy
22	for the US hop industry.
23	Past hop marketing orders have categorically failed, and
24	there is no reason to believe that a new order would
25	work any better. In fact, there is every reason to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	anticipate that the proposed HMO would fare far worse
2	than the old ones.
3	Again, Judge Clifton, Ms. Deskins, all other USDA
4	representatives, participants, I appreciate you for
5	allowing me to make these comments. Thank you.
6	***
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Dr. Kloth, thank
8	you. I would like now to open the floor for questions,
9	and I'd like to begin with any questions that people
10	oppose to the marketing order proposal might have.
11	MR. CARSWELL: I have a few questions, Your
12	Honor.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Carswell.
14	MR. CARSWELL: Thank you.
15	* * *
16	BY MR. CARSWELL:
17	Q. Mr. Kloth, can you describe how you
18	understand how the initial base allotments would be
19	established under the proposed HMO?
20	A. Well, I thought I kind of understood it,
21	but after listening to some of the other comments, I'm
22	going to have to reevaluate. So let me give you my
23	impression of how I think it would work.
24	It's my understanding that you would go back over a
25	six-year period, determine the a year that you would
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	probably have maximized your production, and that would
2	be the year that you would submit as far as establishing
3	year base. Then this would go into the committee for
4	determination, and I think the end result of that based
5	on what I know is you're going to have a
6	significantly-elevated saleable base versus actual
7	production.
8	Q. By the way, forgive me, sir. I'm not
9	used to calling you anything other than Don, but it's
10	Dr. Kloth, and I apologize for that.
11	A. Well, why don't we just make it Don?
12	Q. Okay.
13	A. Okay.
14	Q. Sounds good to me.
15	* * *
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You'll still be Dr.
17	Kloth to me.
18	DR. KLOTH: The Judge speaks.
19	* * *
20	BY MR. CARSWELL:
21	Q. Dr. Kloth, I believe you alluded earlier
22	to the fact that, in your comments, that you believe
23	that the there would be a drastic cut in the saleable
24	quantity to reduce the level of hop production. Could
25	you explain why you think that there'll be a drastic cut
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	needed:
2	A. Well, I have done some preliminary
3	calculations on the back of an envelope, and it would
4	appear to me that when you take the best production year
5	by each grower and anyone can make their own
6	calculations, but I think it could be upward of 40
7	percent above the existing production level. So, first
8	of all, you're going to have to cut 40 percent. Our
9	concern is just to get it back to where the production
10	level is today.
11	Now, any grower who has had steady production or
12	increasing production is going to have to take a
13	disproportionate hit to his actual operation versus
14	anyone who might have had a declining production plan.
15	So the net result of that is you're going to have excess
16	saleable allotment with those who have had declining
17	production, and they will make those then available to
18	folks that have had increasing production or need
19	increased allotment in order to expand their operations.
20	Q. So you believe that in the event of a
21	drastic cut that those growers who have been steady or
22	expanding will have to acquire base to keep the product
23	at an existing to keep their production at existing
24	or expanding levels?
25	A. That would be my belief.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Q. Do you believe that this need for base,
2	this need to acquire base will create an artificial or
3	and by artificial I mean man-made as compared to
4	market-forced-created value for the base?
5	A. I believe it will. I've been involved in
6	a limited number of other types of allotment programs.
7	I think the previous allotment or Hop Marketing Order
8	created a value on this concept. Many years ago I
9	remember in rice there was a land value that was
10	capitalized into having ownership of rice allotments. I
11	think that's correct.
12	Q. Don, would you characterize the expense
13	of acquiring base as an additional cost for those
14	growers who would need to acquire base?
15	A. Well, I think there would be an
16	additional cost, and I think that the customers would
17	eventually be asked to cover a portion of that cost, if
18	not all of it.
19	Q. Would you believe that the need to
20	acquire base for those growers who would need to acquire
21	it would compete with other costs that they might
22	otherwise choose to spend their money on, such as
23	capital investments to improve their operations?
24	A. I think that's a safe assumption.
25	Q. Do you believe that this additional cost
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	will disadvantage US hop growers who have to acquire
2	base in their competition with foreign hop growers?
3	A. Anytime you increase your cost base
4	structure you're going to put yourself somewhat at a
5	disadvantage to your competition.
6	Q. Do you also think that this additional
7	cost will disadvantage US hops growers who have to
8	acquire base in their competition with other US hop
9	growers who do not have to acquire base?
10	A. I think it will.
il	Q. Do you believe that this competitive
12	disadvantage vis-à-vis US hop growers who need base and
13	those who don't would be exacerbated in those situations
14	where the US hop growers who don't need base are also
15	being paid money for their base?
16	A. I think the logic is there that it would.
17	Q. These would be hop growers who are
18	selling base but are obviously remaining in the market
19	as well.
20	A. Right.
21	Q. Do you believe that this additional cost
22	borne by net acquirers of base and value obtained by net
23	sellers of base constitutes an artificial transfer of
24	wealth from net acquirers to net sellers?
25	A. Yes, I think that would be the case.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Q. Finally, Don, considering the presence of
2	foreign competition, do you believe that any output
3	restrictions under the HMO would result in any
4	sustainable price increases by US hop growers?
5	A. Well, my view of that is that you have
6	two markets. You have the high-alpha market, and I
7	think that it will be interesting to see how you're
8	going to get price increases in a global market where
9	competition is pretty intense. On the alpha side I
10	think as you bring forth the cost of people who are
11	wanting to expand their acreage and you load up their
12	cost structure, then the domestic or the long-term
13	contract players, you know, I think there you might see
14	some price escalation. Or at least that will be the
15	attempt.
16	I think that what will then become telling on that is
17	whether or not there is substitutability in foreign
18	sources or whether you stay with the domestic producers.
19	***
20	MR. CARSWELL: That's all I had, Don. Thank
21	you very much.
22	DR. KLOTH: Okay.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
24	Carswell. Additional questions from those who are here
25	to present a position against the proposals? Mr. Moody. York Stenographic Services, Inc.

l	***
2	BY MR. MOODY:
3	Q. Yes, Dr. Kloth, thank you. You mentioned
4	four or five examples of the benefits of foreign
5	contracting. That would supply assurance, price
6	assurance for the growers, quality assurance for you as
7	a purchaser, planning purposes, balancing supply and
8	demand, et cetera. And then you went on to testify that
9	HMO, if implemented, would jeopardize your plans for
10	continuing those foreign contracts or put them at risk.
11	I just want to explore that just a little bit. Do the
12	benefits of foreign contracting that you testified to
13	help provide stability in the context of an underlying
14	free market operation?
15	A. If I understand the question, I think
16	that our forward contracts really do bring stability in
17	a free-market environment. And I say that because that
18	is an interchange between customer and supplier, and
19	that to me is a great it's been a great tool for the
20	producers as well as our company, and I think that it
21	does fall within the free-market system.
22	I don't know does that answer your question?
23	Q. Yes, it does, and does the fact that
24	so it would be would it be correct to say that
25	implementing an HMO would actually threaten or put at
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	risk or end those benefits that are presently available
2	in the free market?
3	A. Well, there are a lot of factors to
4	consider, you know, as it relates to that. Right now it
5	is very difficult to determine what the saleable
6	allotments might be for any of our supplier base, and
7	that is a real problem. We haven't gone in and
8	evaluated each of our suppliers, but it certainly, I
9	think, throws a curve ball at good planning and analysis
10	as to how you move forward as a team. I think that over
11	the last 15 years Anheuser-Busch and the growing
12	community where we have hop contracts, it's been a team
13	effort, and I think that this is raising some issues
14	around how you keep that going, given the uncertainties
15	and the factors that come into play when you boil all
16	this these different issues down.
17	Q. All right. Were you involved in the
18	on the purchasing side while the old marketing order
19	was in effect?
20	A. Let's see. Yes, I was.
21	Q. Okay. If you have if you can just
22	briefly say what if you were involved, if you have
23	knowledge about that, about what some of the problems of
24	the old order were and whether the Proponent's proposal

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

in any way addresses those problems.

25

1	A. I had just gotten into my current
2	position maybe one or two years prior to that. All I
3	will tell you is at that point in time we purchased our
4	hops primarily through other handlers. We did not have
5	the direct grower contract program at that point in
6	time, so I think there was an altogether different set
7	of dynamics, you know, that were at play there versus
8	what is here today.
9	Q. All right. Okay. And so then since the
10	termination of the old order, all those benefits you
11	testified to of forward contracting really came into
12	play, were really developed under the free-market system
13	that's been in place since the termination of the old
14	order.
15	A. Correct.
16	Q. Okay.
17	***
18	MR. MOODY: Thanks very much, Dr. Kloth.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
20	Moody. Are there additional questions from those who
21	are here against the proposal? Dr. Jekanowski. Would
22	you introduce yourselves to Dr. Kloth so he knows your
23	background?
24	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Yeah. My name is Mark
25	Jekanowski. I'm an agriculture economist with Sparks
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	0.4 3.7 .1 .0

1	Companies. Just a real quick question, a couple of
2	short questions.
3	***
4	BY DR. JEKANOWSKI:
5	Q. Based on your knowledge of the hop
6	industry and the hop market, to your knowledge are there
7	any strict border controls regarding importing foreign
8	hops? Are there any barriers to firms bringing hops in
9	from overseas if they can't get them domestically?
10	A. I think there is a small duty that is
11	paid on most imported hops, and other than that I see
12	really no barriers. There are no USDA quarantines or
13	anything of that nature.
14	Q. So basically that basically answers my
15	question. So basically there's not anything that will
16	fundamentally restrict a US purchaser or brewer from
17	sourcing hops overseas.
18	A. Not to my knowledge anyway.
19	***
20	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Thank you.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We'll
22	change the tape now at 12:54.
23	***
24	[Tape 3 Side 2]
25	***

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
2	record at 12:55. Any other questions from those who are
3	here in a position against the proposal?
4	There appear to be none. There is? No. All
5	right. Any questions from those who are here supporting
6	the proposal? Mr. Monahan.
7	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	* * *
9	BY MR. MONAHAN:
10	Q. Dr. Kloth, my name is Brendan Monahan. I
11	represent the Proponent's Committee. I've been assured
12	by members of the committee that Anheuser-Busch has been
13	a tremendous friend and ally of the American hop grower,
14	and I have some I do have some questions, however,
15	about the historical practices of Anheuser-Busch under
16	the old marketing order. I understand if you don't have
17	any personal knowledge. You can let me know.
18	A. Well, plus, if you'll remember, I'm over
19	60 so maybe I don't remember quite as well.
20	Q. I understand. I understand. My
21	understanding, sir, is that Anheuser-Busch began its
22	program of direct purchasing with American hop growers
23	in the mid '80s.
24	A. I would say the late.
25	Q. Okay.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	A. I'd say '86, '86, '88, in that range.
2	Q. Okay. So it's fair to say that at the
3	conclusion or rather subsequent to the expiration of the
4	old Hop Marketing Order.
5	A. Correct.
6	Q. And at least as I understand it
7	Anheuser-Busch has recognized the tremendous superior
8	quality of the hops grown by American hop growers and
9	has rewarded them for that in this timeframe.
10	A. I think that's been a joint effort.
11	Q. Right. Under the previous Hop Marketing
12	Order my understanding is that Anheuser-Busch actually
13	acquired American hops through dealers. Is that right?
14	A. Right.
15	Q. Do you know if they utilized ford
16	contracts with the dealers, or did they buy on the spot
17	market every year?
18	A. I can't answer that definitively.
19	Q. Okay.
20	A. I just don't know.
21	Q. Thank you, sir. Did to the best of
22	your knowledge from 1966, through 1985, and I know I'm
23	going to have to rely on your historical archived
24	knowledge, institutional knowledge, are you aware of any
25	time that the Anheuser-Busch Company received less
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	quantity of American hops than it desired?
2	A. I can give you my suspicion.
3	Q. Let me
4	A. I'm sorry.
5	QI would first like to exhaust your
6	knowledge, if you actually know.
7	A. I don't actually know.
8	Q. What do you suspect, sir?
9	A. I think that there were probably times
10	when we did have shortfalls, but that it may have been
11	because of crop growing conditions as much as anything
12	else. And it's because of this that we do even today
13	carry significant inventories.
14	Q. I see. So any shortages that you would
15	suspect would be related to Mother Nature and not volume
16	restrictions.
17	A. Correct.
18	Q. All right.
19	***
20	MR. MONAHAN: That's all I have. Thank you
21	very much.
22	DR. KLOTH: Okay.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
24	Monahan. Other questions by those who are here in favor
25	of the proposal? There appear to be none. I'd invite

York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	questions now from the USDA representatives who are
2	here.
3	MS. DESKINS: We have no questions.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
5	you, Ms. Deskins.
6	***
7	BY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
8	Q. I wanted to make sure I understood your
9	use of the term, 70 percent, when you were talking about
10	the source of hops worldwide. Would you tell me again
1 1	what that figure was?
12	A. Well, it's my understanding that the US
13	production represents about 70 to 75 percent of world
14	production.
15	* * *
16	MR. CARSWELL: Don, I think you misstated
17	that.
18	DR. KLOTH: Did I? Correct me then.
19	MR. CARSWELL: Well, I don't want to put words
20	in your mouth, but I believe you did it you stated it
21	backwards. If you'd just look at the look at your
22	statement or your comments and state it again. I think
23	you'll get it right.
24	DR. KLOTH: Well, let me state it without
25	finding it. I think that the US production represents
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	25 percent of world production.
2	MR. CARSWELL: Right.
3	DR. KLOTH: Is that that's what I thought I
4	said. Maybe being over 60 is even a shorter frame than
5	I
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That is what you
7	had indicated when you first read your statement, that
8	70 percent of the worldwide production is foreign, and I
9	was surprised that it's that great.
10	***
11	BY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
12	Q. But that's what do you base that on?
13	A. Well, I think that, you know, there is
14	production data that reflects that kind of production
15	history, and you have to keep in mind that the east
16	European countries have increased production rather
17	dramatically in recent years.
18	Q. Which countries would those be?
19	A. I think the Chinese are really starting
20	to produce significantly.
21	Q. Now, I was aware of references to
22	Germany, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia, and
23	then China.
24	A. Uh-huh.
25	Q. Are you aware of any other major hop
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	producing nations?
2	A. Well, you have France, you have
3	Czechoslovakia, you have Poland. That's all that comes
4	to my mind right now, although, you know, hops can grow
5	anywhere. But I think those would be the predominant
6	ones. A little bit in Chili, a very small quantity.
7	Chili or Argentina. A very small quantity.
8	***
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
10	you. Follow-up questions. Mr. Carswell.
11	MR. CARSWELL: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
12	* * *
13	BY MR. CARSWELL:
14	Q. Don, I just wanted to ask you, it's kind
15	of a redirect from something that Brendan asked you
16	about buying from American hop growers, has
17	Anheuser-Busch bought significant quantities of hops
18	from foreign producers?
19	A. Yes, we have.
20	* * *
21	MR. CARSWELL: That's all I had. Thank you.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
23	Carswell. Mr. Monahan.
24	* * *
25	BY MR. MONAHAN:

1	Q. My question, sir, Dr. Kloth, relates to
2	the 70 percent figure you used. As I understand it the
3	American hop grower produces about 30 percent of the
4	world market when we're talking about pounds of raw
5	hops. Isn't that right?
6	A. I it's in the ballpark. It's plus or
7	minus by 70 percent by a few percentage points.
8	Q. My point being that we are talking about
9	raw pounds. Correct?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. When we actually do the analysis on alpha
12	production, pounds and kilograms of alpha, it's actually
13	right around 50/50, wouldn't you agree?
14	A. To tell you the truth I don't look at
15	alpha. Our company uses very little high-alpha hops, so
16	we just don't concentrate on it unless it gets involved
17	in these kinds of issues.
18	Q. So you wouldn't know the breakdown
19	between
20	A. No.
21	Q US and foreign production of alpha
22	acids?
23	A. No.
24	***
25	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, sir.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any additional
2	questions for Dr. Kloth? There are none. You may step
3	down. Thank you, Dr. Kloth.
4	DR. KLOTH: Thank you.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Carswell, did
6	does either you or Mr. Moody intend to call any other
7	witnesses today?
8	MR. CARSWELL: Actually, yes, Your Honor, I
9	believe some, well, I won't speak for Mr. Moody. I'm
10	aware of some other growers who have come, and by the
11	way, Your Honor, I've given up on trying to personally
12	leave early today if, because of these other people
13	showing up and wanting to testify and this being their
14	last chance to do it.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh. This is
16	shifting earth here beneath my feet. How many of you
17	have made arrangements now to leave in accordance with
18	out completing at 3:00 that would difficult to change?
19	Several. Can you undo it, and we work until 5:00?
20	Okay. I think we'd better work until 5:00. I certainly
21	don't want to miss a witness who is available to us
22	today who will not be available next week in Yakima.
23	All right. Would it be a good time to break
24	for lunch? It's 1:05. And can everyone make due with
25	an hour? All right. Please be back and ready to go at
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	2:05.
2	***
3	[Off the record]
4	[On the record]
5	***
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We're
7	back on record. Before we begin with the next witness I
8	did want to give you an idea as to the amount of time
9	consumed so far, because I was asked about that. I want
10	you to bear in mind that the breaks that I take for
11	comfort breaks, the questions I ask, the questions that
12	the representatives from USDA ask are not counted.
13	Nevertheless, it appears we haven't put in much time
14	here. I'm going to work backwards. So far today those
15	in favor of the proposals have consumed three-quarters
16	of an hour. And those against have consumed two hours.
17	I round to the nearest five minutes.
18	Yesterday those using time who are against the
19	proposals consumed four and a half hours. Those in
20	favor consumed a half an hour. Our first day those in
21	favor of the proposals consumed two hours, and those
22	against consumed two and a half hours.
23	So I didn't add up all those totals, if
24	somebody wants to do that for me and tell me, then I'll
25	be able to keep track. Did you do it, Mr. Monahan?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. MONAHAN: I'll invite anyone to check my
2	math, but I have three hours, no, excuse me. Three .25
3	hours for the Proponents and nine hours even for the
4	opposition.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. So, Mr.
6	Moody, you're doing fine. I know you were concerned
7	that you have equal opportunity to present your point of
8	view.
9	MR. MOODY: Right, and I was actually kind of
10	when we brought that up on the conference call, I was
11	sort of thinking about the merits rather than sort of
12	focusing on all the cross, and I know that sometimes
13	it's hard to anticipate how much time cross is going to
14	take in advance. But we're certainly and I speak for
15	myself, and I'm sure I speak for everybody in the room,
16	including Brendan and his team, that we're all trying to
17	keep our focus on moving this along and not trying to do
18	anything on either side that constitutes a delay of
19	game.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Absolutely. I've
21	been very impressed with the way you've proceeded, and I
22	appreciate that very much. However, and I didn't say
23	this in the phone call when we were talking about equal
24	time, but I always count cross the same as direct exam.
25	And I have run trials this way. I have taken into
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	account how many hours we had allotted for a trial, and
2	I had given each side half the time, and it's very
3	nerve-wracking, but it does get the hearing done.
4	Okay. Good. Now, who will be next to call a
5	witness?
6	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, the Proponents would
7	like to call Mr. Rod Christensen to the stand.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
9	Although you have introduced yourself earlier in the day
10	I'd still like you again to state your full name and
11	spell it for the record.
12	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Rod Christensen, R-o-d,
13	C-h-r-i-s-t-e-n-s-e-n.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. And
15	would you raise your right hand, and I'll swear you in.
16	* * *
17	[Witness sworn]
18	* * *
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Mr.
20	Monahan, will you have the preliminary questions?
21	MR. MONAHAN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may proceed.
23	***
24	ROD CHRISTENSEN,
25	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	testified as follows:
2	BY MR. MONAHAN:
3	Q. Thanks, Mr. Christensen, in an effort to
4	balance the proceedings I'm going to ask you to talk for
5	the next six hours straight. Is that all right?
6	A. It's okay.
7	Q. Just teasing. You've been can you
8	please describe the role you played in the preparation
9	of the proposed Hop Marketing Order that was included in
10	the Federal Register?
11	A. I was hired by the Proponent's Committee
12	to just advise on language and for some sections of the
13	order and help draft some of that language to present to
14	the Department and further to help in the steps leading
15	up to this hearing.
16	Q. And in all fairness to you, sir, can you
17	please inform the Judge and the USDA when I asked you to
18	take the stand and testify today?
19	A. This morning.
20	Q. Thank you very much. What I would like
21	you to do, sir, is to turn to Section 991.30 of the
22	proposed order, and just explain for us here I should
23	expand my question. 991.30 and 991.31 and explain for
24	us here what the expenses and assessments provisions
25	were intended to accomplish and how they are intended to

I	work.
2	A. Okay. What I would like to do, I'd like
3	to just state that although I'm somewhat familiar with a
4	lot of the language and the intent behind it, I don't
5	present myself in any way as an expert on the hop
6	industry and the intricacies of hop marketing. But I'll
7	do my best to present these sections that I've been
8	assigned.
9	And the way I would like to do that is just simply to
10	read those sections into the record and then take
11	questions about them.
12	So beginning with Section 991.30, expenses, the
13	committee is authorized to incur such expenses as the
14	Secretary finds are reasonable and likely to be incurred
15	by it for such purposes as the Secretary may, pursuant
16	to this part, determine to be appropriate and for the
17	maintenance and functioning of the committee during each
18	marketing year.
19	The committee shall submit to the Secretary a budget for
20	each marketing year, including an explanation of the
21	items appearing therein and a recommendation as to the
22	rate of assessment for such year.
23	Section 991.31, assessments, part A, requirements for
24	payment. Each person who first handles hops shall pay
25	to the committee upon demand that handler's pro rata
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	share of the expenses authorized by the Secretary for
2	each marketing year. Each handler's pro rata share for
3	each variety of hops sold shall be the rate of
4	assessment fixed by the Secretary times the number of
5	pounds of that variety of hops sold times the alpha acid
6	factor for that variety of hops, which the handler
7	handles as the first handler thereof.
8	The payment of assessments for the maintenance and
9	functioning of the committee and for such purposes as
10	the secretary may, pursuant to this part, determine to
11	be appropriate, may be required under this part
12	throughout the period it is in effect, irrespective of
13	whether particular provisions thereof are suspended or
14	become inoperative.
15	B, part of assessment. The Secretary shall fix the rate
16	of assessment to be paid by each handler. In order to
17	provide funds for the administration of this part before
18	sufficient operating income is available from
19	assessments, the committee may accept advanced
20	assessments and may also borrow money for such purposes.
21	Advanced assessments received from a handler shall be
22	credited toward assessments levied against the handler
2 3	during the marketing year.
24	C. Assessments not paid within the time prescribed by
25	the committee may be made subject to interest or late
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	payment charges or both. The period of time, rate of
2	interest, and late payment charge will be as recommended
3	by the committee, provided that when interest or late
4	payment charges are in effect, they shall be applied to
5	all assessments not paid within the prescribed period of
6	time.
7	D, excess funds. At the end of a marketing year funds
8	in excess of the year's expenses may be placed in an
9	operating reserve not to exceed approximately one
10	marketing year's operational expenses or such lower
11	limits as the committee, with the approval of the
12	Secretary, may establish. Funds in such reserves shall
13	be available for use by the committee for expenses
14	authorized pursuant to 991.30. Funds in excess of those
15	placed in the operating reserve shall be refunded to
16	handlers, provided that any sum paid by a first handler
17	in excess of that handler's pro rata share of the
18	expenses during any marketing year may be applied by the
19	committee at the end of such marketing year to any
20	outstanding obligations due the committee from such
21	person. Each handler's share of such excess funds shall
22	be the amount of assessments paid in excess of that
23	handler's pro rata share.
24	E, disposition of funds upon termination of order. Upon
25	termination of this part any funds not required to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	24 North George St., Vork. DA 17401 (717) 954 0077

1	defray the necessary expenses of liquidation shall be
2	disposed of in such manner as the Secretary may
3	determine to be appropriate, provided that to the extent
4	practicable such funds will be returned pro rata to the
5	first handler from whom such funds were collected.
6	The committee part F. The committee may establish
7	rules and regulations necessary and incidental to the
8	administration of this section.
9	Q. Now, sir, as a professional consultant
10	who's aided in the preparation of these provisions, is
11	it fair to say that you have some familiarity with other
12	Federal marketing orders?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Is there anything in the two provisions
15	that you just read that you would consider to be unique
16	or unusual or specifically tailored to the hop industry?
17	A. No.
18	Q. Okay. Do you have any other remarks or
19	observations about these two provisions?
20	A. I do not.
21	* * *
22	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Christensen is
23	going to be asked to talk about three different
24	provisions in the marketing order, and I would leave it
25	to your judgment as to whether it makes sense to invite
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	cross examination section by section or to go all the
2	way through.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Section by section,
4	please.
5	MR. MONAHAN: Then I would yield the floor,
6	Your Honor.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I would
8	invite questions about the provisions that Mr.
9	Christensen has covered so far, first of all from those
10	who are here in favor of the proposals. There are none.
11	Now from those who are here in a position
12	against the proposals. There are none.
13	Now I would invite questions from
14	representatives of the Department of Agriculture. Ms.
15	Finn.
16	MS. FINN: Thank you.
17	***
18	BY MS. FINN:
19	Q. Since you were just helping as far as
20	with the appropriate terminology for marketing orders
21	under assessments, I mean, under expenses, you didn't
22	get into with the Proponent Committee what exactly they
23	had in mind and what type of expenses or budgetary items
24	they might have?
25	A. Not we didn't enumerate those things.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

l	There are provisions in the order that provide authority
2	to do various things, research and development, for
3	example. And I think at this point many of those kinds
4	of sections are there as a possible activity that the
5	committee might undertake. And so, you know, I think
5	the Proponent Committee has not, you know, is very
7	willing to wait for the first administrative committee
8	to be seated to determine to what extent they want to
9	involve themselves in some of those activities.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Can you talk about some of the things that you're familiar with that are normal and customary, some types of expenses that committees have?
- Well, normal and customary expenses would be management, you know, hiring a managing firm to administer the provisions of the order, expenses for holding meetings, travel expenses to bring committee members and alternates to meetings, additional administrative-type expenses in terms of supplies, copying, mailing, phones, and so forth. It's not unusual for part of that administrative expense to include travel for a field man to visit growers and handlers, you know, in the process of their duties to assure compliance and help the industry understand and abide by the provisions of the order.
 - Ο. And handlers are assessed under the York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	marketing orders. Is that correct?
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. In your experiences, in your experience
4	do the benefits of paying the assessment outweigh these
5	costs usually?
6	A. In my experience they definitely
7	outweigh, yeah, the costs. The benefits outweigh the
8	costs. Yes.
9	Q. Were you involved in the discussion on
10	how they were going to determine the assessment weight,
11	the assessment for handlers?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Could you explain what the alpha acid
14	factor is then?
15	A. The alpha acid factor is a factor
16	determined at the time of that the marketing policy
17	is established, and it's a factor that's applied to each
18	variety of hops, which seeks to be the typical or
19	average amount of alpha acid for that particular
20	variety. And that is established each year for each
21	variety of hops to give growers an indication, a fairly
22	clear indication of how much, how many pounds of hops
23	they can produce that will result in the approximate
24	amount of alpha acid that they that the saleable
25	represents.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Q. Is it common from state to state that a
2	certain variety of hops would have similar percentages,
3	alpha acid percentages?
4	A. You mean the same variety grown in one
5	state or another state?
6	Q. Yes.
7	A. You know, I'm not an expert on that. I
8	assume that they would be very similar, but I can't say
9	for sure.
10	Q. So what they would I'm trying to get
11	at how they actually go about coming up with an
12	equitable percentage for each variety, and if that's
13	going to be how that's going to be agreed upon.
14	A. Well, those averages, I think those alpha
15	acid percentages are a matter of record. I think one of
16	the pluses in the hop industry is that there's an
17	abundance of record keeping and statistical information,
18	and with state commissions and state inspection services
19	maintaining records on alpha acid content, I think it's
20	going to be a fairly straightforward process for the
21	committee to determine, for example, a three-year
22	average of alpha acid for any particular variety based
23	on statistical information that's already a matter of
24	record.
25	Q. And it isn't generally a controversial or
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	disputed number that comes
2	A. Correct.
3	Qit's usually an agreed-upon number?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. Why is it more equitable to determine
6	assessments on the alpha acid percentage rather than the
7	quantity of hops received?
8	A. Well, I think the reason that the alpha
9	that saleable quantity is based on alpha acid is
10	because alpha acid is a component that is universal
11	across all varieties, and therefore, by establishing a
12	saleable percentage or a quantity based on alpha acid,
13	an umbrella is created that covers all varieties,
14	allowing individual growers the flexibility of
15	determining which varieties they would like to produce
16	under that one umbrella of alpha acid.
17	And so I think that it the intent and the reason that
18	this was developed was to allow as much flexibility as
19	possible to the growers to determine what they would
20	grow, what varieties they would grow, how much of those
21	varieties they would grow, and when.
22	Q. Do you think that might be cumbersome to
23	administer since there are so many varieties of hops?
24	A. I think just the opposite. I think it
25	simplifies the ability to administer the order, because
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	the regulated product is just one thing, alpha acid, and
2	it doesn't really matter which variety is being
3	marketed. The saleable certificates won't enumerate
4	different varieties, and there won't be different
5	allotment certificates for each variety. There will
6	just be one allotment certificate containing the pounds
7	of alpha acid for that particular grower, and he will be
8	able to market any variety that he happens to grow that
9	year under the single certificate.
10	So I think it streamlines and simplifies the
11	administrative part.
12	Q. Could you explain why there would be the
13	need to put a provision in there for interest and late
14	payment charges?
15	A. Just simply to encourage timely payment
16	of assessments that are due the committee. You know,
17	the provision is there that allows penalty for late
18	payment, and that provides incentive to get the payments
19	in on time.
20	Q. There's a provision in under the
21	assessments allowing the committees to borrow money.
22	What types of situations would a committee need to
23	borrow money?
24	A. I think essentially only in the beginning
25	stages, you know, for start-up money. As the committee

1	gets established and incurs expenses in that process,
2	they will likely, I don't think it would be unusual for
3	them to be in a position where they would have to borrow
4	some money to cover those start-up expenses.
5	Other than that I can't foresee too many, you know, any,
6	really, any circumstances where the committee would
7	borrow money. I think most committees would and I'm
8	sure this one would be the same, are committed to being
9	very sound financially to establishing a working reserve
10	fund that approximates one year's operating expenses,
11	and to, you know, run on a cash basis.
12	Q. Why is one year determined to be an
13	adequate reserve?
14	A. Oh, a couple of reasons. I think one is
15	precedent. That's, you know, a typical amount that is
16	established for most marketing orders, and I think
17	secondly that it's logical to have approximately one
18	year to cover expenses in the event of a low sales year,
19	for example, which would reduce the amount of income for
20	any particular year. One year's reserve should be
21	adequate to cover those kinds of unexpected decreases in
22	income.
23	***
24	MS. FINN: Thank you. That's all I have.
25	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.
2	Finn. Ms. Dec.
3	***
4	BY MS. DEC:
5	Q. Mr. Christensen
6	A. Yes.
7	QI know you have quite a bit of
8	experience in administrative marketing orders. Are you
9	involved with administering any right now?
10	A. I am.
11	Q. And which one would that be?
12	A. I administer the Spearmint Marketing
13	Order.
14	Q. And that order is producer allotments?
15	A. Correct.
16	Q. Somewhat similar to this proposal?
17	A. Correct. Uh-huh.
18	Q. Could you tell me how much the spearmint
19	oil budget is on an annual basis?
20	A. Our annual budget right now is about
21	\$170,000.
22	Q. And would you have an opinion as to
23	whether the hop program could be administered for about
24	that, more than that, less than that?
25	A. You know, that's a real estimate, not
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	knowing all of the activities that that committee might
2	choose to be involved in, but my rough estimate is that,
3	yeah, for approximate, something under \$200,000 annually
4	I think that this kind of a program could be ably
5	administered.
6	***
7	MS. DEC: Thank you.
8	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Uh-huh.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms. Dec.
10	Ms Dr. Hinman.
11	DR. HINMAN: Yes.
12	* * *
13	BY DR. HINMAN:
14	Q. Mr. Christensen, you stated the alpha
15	acid factor, the industry-wide average by variety.
16	Would you have available a list for say a recent year
17	for which complete data is available of such a list of
18	factors or averages?
19	A. I don't. I don't have such lists. I
20	don't know if they're available. Are they available?
21	I'm being told they are available. Yes.
22	***
23	MR. MONAHAN: The Proponent's Committee would
24	be happy to supplement and amend the record with an
25	exhibit that we would deliver in Yakima.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	DR. HINMAN: Thank you.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Broadbent.
3	MR. BROADBENT: Yes.
4	***
5	BY MR. BROADBENT:
6	Q. Who would ultimately be liable if the
7	committee or a committee employee incurred an expense
8	that wasn't deemed reasonable, necessary, or in the
9	budget? Ultimately if the USDA determined if it was
10	unreasonable or unnecessary.
11	A. Who would be liable for an expense that,
12	who, the committee itself incurred?
13	Q. Uh-huh.
14	A. That was
15	Q. Yes.
16	Aor the administrative or the
17	management of the committee?
18	Q. Either the committee or committee
19	employee.
20	A. Well, the most management firms are
21	bonded to cover such actions. If the committee I
22	guess I'm not you'll have to explain to me what kind
23	of an expense you're talking about. The committee
24	itself incurred an expense that wasn't authorized? Give
25	me an example. I don't know
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Q. I guess mostly this is would be
2	concerning a committee employee.
3	A. You know, a committee employee, you know,
4	is ought to be, I think, the committee's
5	responsibility is to make sure that employees are bonded
6	and insured against any kind of misrepresentation or
7	inappropriate use of funds to cover that.
8	Does that answer your
9	Q. That covers it. Yes.
10	Aquestion or okay.
1	Q. And then with regard to late charges,
12	would they be more practical in nature, do you envision
13	them being more in terms of interest charges or
14	interest, reflecting interest or punitive in nature to
15	make sure that everybody pays on time?
16	A. Well, I just I would envision them to
17	be more interest. I think that the approach that at
18	least I would recommend be taken is one of seeking to
19	cooperatively work out the problem to make sure that due
20	notice is given and that the affected handler
21	understands exactly what is expected of him, the amount,
22	and when it should have been paid and proceed, you know,
23	step by step in a process of working together with him
24	to get the payment. If all of that fails, then, you
25	know, late charges would be followed by more punitive
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	action.
2	* * *
3	MR. BROADBENT: Thank you.
4	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Uh-huh.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
6	Broadbent. Ms. Deskins.
7	* * *
8	BY MS. DESKINS:
9	Q. Mr. Christensen, in Section 991.31, the
10	term, first handler, is used a couple of times.
11	A. Uh-huh.
12	Q. And also the term, handler. Are they
13	supposed to have different meanings?
14	A. Well, I think in terms of, you know,
15	living assessments that it there's an important
16	distinction to be made by first handler. That is the
17	handler that acquires the alpha acid from the producer.
18	That's the first handler, you know. What happens to it
19	after that could occur among other handlers who are not
20	necessarily the first handler, and so I think it's just
21	a distinction to show exactly at what point the
22	assessment is levied.
23	Q. Well, then should the definition of
24	handler in the definition section do you need a
25	definition that defines what a first handler is?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

34 North George St., York, PA 1/401 - (/1/) 834-00/

1	A. I don't think so. I think that the term
2	itself explains it adequately, that it's the first, you
3	know, the first person to acquire the product from the
4	producer is the first handler. But if you
5	Q. Okay. So someone I'm just trying to
6	understand, though. Someone reading this should know
7	that that's what that term means?
8	A. I think so. I'm inclined to feel that
9	way. Uh-huh.
10	Q. Okay. And also in 991.318 it says that
11	hops shall be paid to the committee upon demand. Does
12	that then require the committee to give an invoice to
13	handlers so that they know they need to pay their
14	assessments?
15	A. Correct.
16	Q. Okay. And also I don't think I caught
17	all of your answer to Ms. Finn about borrowing money.
18	Did you say you anticipate that after the initial year
19	there won't be a need to borrow money?
20	A. I would hope so. Uh-huh.
21	Q. Okay. What happens if there's people
22	had mentioned there was a problem with powdery mildew
23	one year. What happens if there's a short crop because
24	there's a problem like that, and the committee doesn't
25	have sufficient funds? Will they be able to borrow
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	money?
2	A. They will. They have the authority to
3	borrow money later on, you know, after that first year,
4	but I think the question was what would I typically see
5	as a reason for a committee to have to borrow money, and
6	the most dominant reason that I know of is start-up
7	money to get established. And certainly as soon as
8	possible the committee would build a one-year reserve
9	fund. '
10	***
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Let's
12	pause to change the tape at 2:51.
13	***
14	[Tape 4 Side 1]
15	***
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We're
t 7	back on record at 2:52.
18	***
19	BY MS. DESKINS:
20	Q. Because as this section is written now it
21	doesn't allow the committee to borrow money except for
22	start-up costs.
23	A. Can you point out to me what
24	Q. Yeah.
25	Apart?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Q. If you look at 991.31B.
2	A. Uh-huh.
3	Q. And it says here, "In order to provide
4	funds for the administration of this part before
5	sufficient operating income is available for
6	assessments, the committee may accept advanced
7	assessments and may also borrow money for such purpose."
8	A. You know, I think that that could be
9	applied on a year-to-year basis, so I, you know, my
10	thinking, although I've never we've never had to do
11	that, we've never had to borrow money after the initial
12	start-up in my experience, you know, the rate of
13	assessment is an annual activity. And so, "The
14	Secretary shall fix the rate of assessment to be paid by
15	each handler in order to provide funds for the
16	administration of this part before sufficient operating
17	income is available from assessments." You know, I
18	think I would read that as that could that authorizes
19	the borrowing of money on a year-to-year basis.
20	***
21	MS. DESKINS: I have no further questions.
22	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Okay.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.
24	Deskins. Other questions by representatives of USDA?
25	There are none.

1	Mr. Christensen Mr. Moody, I'll get to you
2	in just a moment.
3	***
4	BY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
5	Q. Is there a built-in incentive to switch
6	to a lower alpha content variety of hops?
7	A. No, I don't think so, you know. I think
8	that each producer is going to receive an allotment base
9	based on varieties that he has historically grown and
10	that, you know, with that allotment base I think, you
11	know, I think he will continue to market those same
12	varieties regardless of their alpha content.
13	Q. And you don't see that he could perhaps
14	make more money by switching to a lower alpha content?
15	A. Well, I know he can sell more pounds of
16	hops that are lower in alpha, but and I'll have to
17	defer to those who know more about the market
18	conditions, but I would assume that a lower a variet
19	that has a lower alpha content probably also has a lowe
20	price that would offset that incentive a little bit.
21	***
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
23	you. Mr. Moody, you had your hand up.
24	MR. MOODY: Thank you, Your Honor.
25	***
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

l	BY MR. MOODY:
2	Q. Mr. Christensen, what is the event that
3	triggers the obligation to pay assessments? Is it good
4	delivery of hops from the producer to the handler or the
5	sale of hops by the handler?
6	A. It's the sale of hops.
7	Q. By the handler?
8	A. To the handler by the producer.
9	Q. All right. What about a situation like
10	Yakima Chief, where the producers are delivering on a
11	consignment basis?
12	A. The definition of handle includes the
13	action of acquiring hops, so when the Yakima Chief,
14	for example, acquires hops from the producer, handling
15	has occurred, and that triggers the assessment.
16	Q. All right. So in the case of Yakima
17	Chief, even though the hops may not be sold by Yakima
18	Chief until some time in the future, the assessments are
19	due upon delivery of the hops from the producer to the
20	handling facility?
21	A. That's correct.
22	Q. All right. Now, for somebody else who's
23	not with Yakima Chief, but they're just having, you
24	know, a contract with a dealer, same answer? Are they
25	assessments are due when they're delivered to the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	dealer?	
2	A. Correct.	
3	Q. So a grower, a consignment-based grower	
4	and a contract-based grower would be treated identically	
5	with respect to the obligation to pay assessments?	
6	A. That's correct.	
7	Q. All right. But the obligation to pay the	
8	assessments is on the handler, right? So Yakima Chief	
9	would say the assessments in the example we were talking	
10	about?	
11	A. That's correct.	
12	Q. And in the and the dealer would in	
13	the contract case the dealer would pay the assessments.	
14	Is that correct?	
15	A. Yeah. That's correct.	
16	Q. All right. Now, is it also correct that	
17	the preparation of hops for market by producer is not	
18	handling?	
19	A. Preparation by the producer?	
20	Q. Uh-huh.	
21	A. Is not handling. That's correct.	
22	Q. All right. So what about so a	
23	producer can take his hops of his own production and	
24	convert them to alpha acid pounds and store them, and no	
25	handling has taken place?	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	

1	A. Well, I guess that we need to define I
2	need to understand what you are defining as preparing
3	for market. A producer preparing hops for market in my
4	mind, as I answered that question, was harvesting them
5	and getting them in a bale or a form that in which
6	they can be delivered to a handler.
7	Q. All right. But I think we had testimony
8	this morning that hops are actually marketed in all
9	sorts of forms, including raw hops, pellets, and
10	extracts, so that they're actually hops are actually
11	marketed in all sorts of different forms. And so given
12	that testimony the preparation for market by a producer
13	would certainly include potentially a whole variety of
14	functions, including the extraction of the alpha acid.
15	A. The answer my answer to that is that
16	if a producer does that, goes through those steps of
17	preparation, that he has not handled those hops.
18	Q. Okay. So when they're, let's say the
19	producer does the extraction and stores the alpha acid
20	for awhile, and then some time later delivers that alpha
21	acid to a dealer, is that the act that would trigger
22	then payment of assessments by the dealer?
23	A. If handling occurs when he delivers those
24	that hop product to the dealer, then the assessment

needs to be paid. If handling occurs at that point.

25

i	Q. All right. And am I correct that
2	handling would occur at that point, when the producer
3	delivers the pounds of alpha acid to a dealer?
4	A. Not necessarily. I think if it's
5	delivered for storage, for example, handling has not yet
6	occurred.
7	Q. Oh. All right. I'm looking at the
8	definition of handle here in point 08, and it says
9	handle means, "To prepare hops for market," but later
10	on, other than a producer doing that. And it also says,
11	"Acquire hops from a producer." It doesn't really say
12	acquire, you know, alpha acid from a producer, but we'll
13	get past that for a second. But it seems that if a
14	dealer gets some alpha acid from a producer for storage
15	purposes, that that still is a handling function.
16	***
17	MR. MONAHAN: If I could just ask for
18	clarification, Jim. Under your hypothetical scenario is
19	the handler acquiring title before storage, because I
20	think the answer perhaps you're not communicating.
21	MR. MOODY: Well, in my earlier questions Mr.
22	Christensen said that consignment or contract sales
23	would be treated the same, so I don't given his
24	earlier answer I don't think it makes any difference at
25	all whether the dealer is acquiring title.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, I think it does
2	because it goes to the intent of the transfer of the
3	hops from the producer to whether it's a consigned,
4	consignment company or a handler. In either case I
5	think if the intent is a transfer of ownership, then
6	that's when handling occurs. If the intent is not for
7	transfer of ownership, then handling has not occurred.
8	MR. MOODY: Oh. All right.
9	***
10	BY MR. MOODY;
11	Q. Well, in a consignment situation do you
12	understand that the consignee actually takes title to
13	the commodity?
14	A. No, I don't think he takes title to it,
15	but I think that he, the grower transfers those hops
16	into the control of that consignment company for the
17	purpose of transferring ownership.
18	Q. Okay. So then does your earlier
19	answer stands that it doesn't a consignment grower
20	and a contract grower are treated the same?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. Okay. So it doesn't matter whether
23	actual legal title shifts to the handler?
24	A. I think that's correct.
25	Q. Okay. All right. Then back to where I
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	was then before. When	the producer actually prepares
2	the hops for market by	extracting the alpha acid and
3	delivers at a later time	ne the alpha acid to a dealer,
4	that would be a handling	ng of those hops, and that would
5	trigger the obligation	of the dealer to pay the
6	assessment at that poin	nt. Is that correct?
7	A. I don't	believe so, because as I've
8	stated the intent in the	nat situation, the way you've
9	described it is not that	at a transfer of ownership
10	necessarily takes place	e.
11	Q. Okay. 1	Now I'm confused. First you tell
12	me that transfer of own	nership doesn't matter.
13	A. No. The	at's not what I said.
14	Q. Okay. (Can we say that legal title and
15	transfer of ownership,	I'm using those to be
16	interchangeable. Lega:	l title and ownership are the sam
17	concept.	
18	A. Okay.	
19	Q. Okay?	
20	A. All righ	nt.
21	Q. All righ	nt. Can you agree with me on
22	that?	
23	A. I think	so.
24	Q. Okay.	In the first instance we're
25	delivering raw hops; or	ne on a consignment basis, one on
		enographic Services, Inc.

1	a contract basis, from a grower to in the first case a
2	consignee such as Yakima Chief, and in the second case
3	to a contract dealer. Okay. Both of those acts
4	constitute handling. Is that correct? And both of
5	those acts would trigger the obligation of the handler
6	to pay the assessments.
7	A. That's the way I would interpret it.
8	Q. Okay.
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. All right. Now, rather than delivering
1 i	the raw hops, we're going to change my hypothetical to
12	where the producer is delivering extracted alpha acid.
13	A. Okay.
14	Q. Okay. Does that act of delivery to a
15	handler trigger the obligation of the handler to pay the
16	assessments?
17	***
18	MR. MONAHAN: Can I just ask for
19	clarification? If the delivery assumes either for
20	purchase by the dealer or for consignment, because I
21	think there's a third alternative that Mr. Christensen
22	is referring to.
23	MR. MOODY: Okay. Right. Just that would
24	be correct.
25	* * *

1	BY MR. MOODY:
2	Q. It would be either for ultimate sale by
3	the dealer or on either a consignment or a contract
4	basis.
5	A. For ultimate sale? What do you mean?
6	You mean in other words for storage for a time?
7	Q. Well, physical movement of hops sorry
8	Of the acid from the producer's facility to the
9	handler's facility. Okay. One on a consignment basis,
10	two on a contract basis.
11	A. You know, bottom line is this. You know,
12	I don't think I've followed your entire scenario, but is
13	hops or hop product are delivered for purchase or
14	consignment to be purchased, then handling has occurred.
15	If those are delivered to a handler for storage, then
16	handling has not occurred.
17	Q. Okay. Storage by the producer then
18	handling hasn't occurred?
19	A. Storage by the handler. The producer
20	delivered it to the handler for storage without an
21	arrangement for purchase, then handling has not
22	occurred.
23	Q. Okay. Well, when in that case where
24	the producers deliver raw hops to a handler for storage,
25	by the handler, when does handling occur?

I	A. Handling occurs when ownership is
2	transferred from the producer to the first handler.
3	That's when handling occurs.
4	Q. Okay. Now, I hate to interrupt you
5	there, but I'm confused again, because when you consign
6	hops to a handler, like Yakima Chief, that is not a
7	transfer of ownership, but you're telling me a minute
8	ago that that is a handling.
9	A. I'm telling you that that delivery is for
10	the purpose of transferring ownership, even though it
11	may not occur at that day, that time, that ownership
12	will be transferred.
13	Q. Okay. But is the if I deliver them or
14	Monday to Yakima Chief on a consignment basis, has
15	handling occurred on Monday?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Okay. So Yakima Chief then owes the
18	assessments?
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. Even though they haven't been sold.
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. Okay. If I deliver to Yakima Chief for
23	storage on Monday, has handling occurred?
24	A. You know, I guess I don't know all of how
25	Yakima Chief, you know, operates and what kind of
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	arrangements they can make with their producers, and so,
2	you know, I'm not going to try to ascertain every
3	situation there as being handling or not being handling.
4	You know, I think that as that the committee would
5	have to make that determination, not only in the case of
6	Yakima Chief but probably in other situations as to
7	exactly when handling occurs.
8	***
9	MR. MOODY: Okay. I think the reason for my
10	confusion and maybe the Proponents can think about this
11	over the weekend and answer it next week is we're I'm
12	trying to compare two situations. One is physical
13	delivery, as to whether that triggers handling, and two
14	is transfer of legal title and when and whether that
15	triggers handling. And I think that's the reason for
16	I apologize. That's the reason, at least for my
17	confusion, because your sometimes in your answers and
18	Mr. Monahan's questions were kind of mixing those two
19	concepts.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And Mr. Moody, do
21	you have a question to follow
22	MR. MOODY: Okay.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:that?
24	MR. MOODY: All right.
25	* * *
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	BY MR. MOODY:
2	Q. Well, but getting back to where I was
3	trying to go, I was trying to get to when you deliver
4	alpha acid, when the delivery of alpha acid constitutes
5	handling, how is the handler supposed to figure out how
6	much assessment is due.
7	A. The assessment is let me read it right
8	from Section 31A. "Each handler's pro rata share for
9	each variety of hops sold shall be the rate of
10	assessment fixed by the Secretary times the number of
11	pounds of that variety of hops sold times the alpha acid
12	factor for that variety of hops, which the handler
13	handles at the first as the first handler thereof."
14	Q. Right. My this is really my last
15	question, but if you're delivering pounds, you said the
16	formula is pounds of hops times alpha acid factor equals
17	assessments. Okay.
18	A. Times the assessment rate. Uh-huh.
19	Q. Times the assessment rate. Now, I'm
20	in my situation I'm delivering pounds of alpha acid,
21	not pounds of hops. So there's nothing to multiply in
22	that formula.
23	A. Then the formula becomes simpler in that

It's the number of pounds of alpha acid times the

24

25

assessment rate.

1	Q. But you don't necessarily know what
2	variety of hops those pounds of acid
3	A. Doesn't
4	Qalpha acid came from.
5	A. It doesn't matter.
6	Q. Okay.
7	***
8	MR. MOODY: I think that's all my questions
9	for now.
10	MR. CHRISTENSEN: All right.
11	MR. MOODY: All right.
12	***
13	BY MR. MOODY:
14	Q. My colleague informs me that there is in
15	turning hops into alpha acid there's a shrinkage factor
16	that comes into play. How would that come into play in
17	the assessment formula?
18	A. A shrinkage factor?
19	Q. Yes.
20	A. I don't know.
21	Q. Okay.
22	A. Because I'm not familiar with that.
23	Q. Okay.
24	A. That term.
25	***
	V 1 C 1 ' T

1	MR. MOODY: Thank you, Mr. Christensen.
2	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Uh-huh.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
4	Moody. Additional questions for Mr. Christensen on this
5	section? Yes. Ms. Finn.
6	MS. FINN: Thank you.
7	***
8	BY MS. FINN:
9	Q. In Section 31F the statement reads, "The
10	committee may establish rules and regulations necessary
11	and incidental to the administration of this section."
12	Is that intended that the committee would establish the
13	rules and regulations or that the committee would
14	recommend rules and regulations to the Secretary and go
15	through out informal rule-making process?
16	A. It was intended that the committee would
17	establish those rules and regulations. Understanding
18	that as with all rules and regulations that the
19	committee establishes, the Secretary has the right to
20	disapprove them, but the intent was that these rules and
21	regulations which would include forms and you know,
22	reporting procedures and so on would be established by
23	the committee.
24	Q. But it would go through the for
25	Secretary's approval. Is that correct?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

•	n. That wash t the intent. It feally wash t
2	the intent that all of those various steps that need to
3	be taken would be submitted for informal rulemaking.
4	Q. So it could just be policy decisions made
5	by the committee?
6	A. Correct.
7	Q. And not sent through the Department.
8	Would something like would establishing an assessment
9	rate
10	A. Certainly the assessment rate needs to be
11	approved by the Secretary. Yes.
12	***
13	MS. FINN: That's all I have.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.
15	Finn. Any other questions from USDA representatives?
16	Any other questions from those here against the
17	proposals? Mr. Monahan, anything further?
18	MR. MONAHAN: I'm going to see if I can help
19	clear up the issue that confounds Mr. Moody.
20	* * *
21	BY MR. MONAHAN:
22	Q. Mr. Christensen, you talked about two
23	specific examples in which handling occurred. The first
24	is which is in which hops or hop products are
25	delivered to a dealer on a purchase and sale agreement.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. That's
3	A. That's one.
4	Qwhen handling occurs and when the
5	assessment is due as it were.
6	A. Uh-huh.
7	* * *
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That was a yes?
9	MR. CHRISTENSEN: That is a yes.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
11	***
12	BY MR. MONAHAN:
13	Q. The second situation is when hops or hop
14	products are delivered to a handler on consignment. Is
15	that right?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Okay. The third situation that, at least
18	as I understand it, was when hops are delivered to a
19	facility to remain in storage. Is that right?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. At least as you were describing that
22	term, is that a situation where the producer retains
23	title, ownership to the hop or hop product?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Retains the right to sell it to any
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	person, whether	r it be that particular the facility or
2	an independent	brewer or whomever?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	Simply pays a rental charge for the
5	storage to this	dealer or handler for who has agreed
6	to store it for	r him?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	Okay. And in that case handling has not
9	yet occurred.	
10	Α.	Handling has not occurred. Correct.
11	Q.	Sir, we talked this morning in the
12	definitions sec	ction about those circumstances in which a
13	producer is als	so a handler. Correct?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	And the assessments under this section
16	are to be paid	by the handler, which in many instances
17	will be the pro	oducer himself.
18	Α.	That's correct.
19	Q.	Him or herself. Excuse me. Is there
20	anything in the	e proposal that would prevent a
21	dealer/handler	from paying the assessment due and then
22	in turn assess:	ing it against the producer?
23	Α.	No. There's nothing to prevent that.
24	Q.	Okay. And so it could very well be that
25	the producers	end up bearing the burden for all the
		York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	assessments paid under this proposal?
2	A. That's correct. In fact, that's more
3	typical of what occurs in these kind of programs.
4	Q. In that case the handler acts primarily
5	as sort of a pass-through?
6	A. Correct.
7	Q. There were some discussions about whether
8	or not it was advantageous for a person to grow aroma
9	hops because of the alpha factors, and I just want to
10	run a couple of hypotheticals at you. Actually, it's
11	just one.
12	If I deliver for sale on a purchase and sale agreement
13	1,000 pounds of aroma hops, do I pay the same assessment
14	as if I delivered 1,000 pounds of high-alpha hops?
15	A. No. You pay a much lower assessment.
16	Q. For?
17	A. For the aroma hops. Presumably, you
18	know, as I understand it, the alpha acid factor for
19	aroma hops would be much, much lower.
20	Q. Okay. So at least in terms of delivery
21	of equal amounts of pounds of raw hops the aroma growers
22	are going to bear a much lower assessment burden.
23	A. That's correct.
24	***
25	MR. MONAHAN: That's all I have, Your Honor.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
2	Monahan. Any other questions for Mr. Christensen on
3	this particular section? Yes. Mr. Roy.
4	***
5	BY MR. ROY:
6	Q. Mr. Christensen.
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. In most commodities in other, like in
9	commissions and grower associations in hops, usually the
10	assessment is by pound. Correct?
11	A. Correct.
12	Q. So in the case of like the Washington
13	State Hop Commission, the assessment is by pounds, so
14	many cents per pound. So aroma hop that produces less
15	versus a high-alpha hop that produces higher, the
16	assessment ratio is similar to the alpha factor. So in
17	other words, you know, if you're like you pay so many
18	cents per pound, and the aroma hop yields X number of
19	pounds per acre, you would be less than if you had
20	A. You're talking about the alpha acid?
21	Q. No. I'm talking about just in like
22	the current hop commission, the same ratio. I mean, the
23	current hop commission has an assessment of per pound of
24	raw hops.
25	A. Okay.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Q. So the assessments would be the ratios
2	would be similar in the alpha factor type.
3	A. I think that's correct, if I understand
4	what you're saying. The aroma yield per acre would be
5	less than the alpha
6	Q. Uh-huh.
7	Ayield per acre, so therefore, yeah,
8	the aroma grower would pay less total assessment.
9	Q. Okay. Thanks.
10	A. Yeah.
11	***
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any other questions
13	of Mr. Christensen. Yes, Ms. Razick.
14	***
15	BY MR. RAZICK:
16	Q. Under Section 991.30 toward the end it
17	says that there's a recommendation made to the Secretary
18	as to the rate of assessment for each year. So is the
19	rate of assessment for each variety that is recommended
20	to the Secretary?
21	A. No. It's the rate of assessment per
22	pound of alpha acid, and that rate would apply to all
23	varieties.
24	Q. So how would the rate differ if it's an
25	aroma variety or an alpha, high-alpha?

1	A. The rate per pound of alpha acid doesn't
2	vary. It's the same, but if an aroma variety has a much
3	lower percent of alpha acid per pound of raw hops, then
4	the assessment rate per pound of raw hops is going to be
5	much lower for an aroma variety than for a high-alpha
6	variety.
7	***
8	MS. RAZICK: Thank you.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any additional
10	questions for Mr. Christensen on this topic? There
11	being none, Mr. Monahan, you may move to the next
12	section.
13	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	***
15	BY MR. MONAHAN:
16	Q. Mr. Christensen, could I get you to jump
17	ahead to Section 991.60.
18	A. Okay.
19	Q. And would ask you to describe what we
20	find at Sections 991.60 through 991.63, and read them
21	into the record, sir.
22	A. Okay. 991.60 reports, Section A,
23	inventory. "Each handler shall file with the committee
24	or its designee a certified report showing such
25	information as the committee may specify with respect to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	any hops which were held by such handler on March 1 and	
2	September 1 of such other or such other dates as the	
3	committee may designate." B, receipts. "Each handler	
4	shall upon request of the committee file with the	
5	committee a certified report showing the quantity of	
6	hops handled." C, other reports. "Upon the request of	
7	the committee each handler shall furnish to the	
8	committee such other information as may be necessary to	
9	enable it to exercise its powers and perform its duties	
10	under this part."	
11	Section 991.61, records. "Each handler shall maintain	
12	such records pertaining to all hops handles as well	
13	substantiate the required reports. All such records	
14	shall be maintained for not less than two years after	
15	the termination of the marketing year to which such	
16	records relate."	
17	Section 991.62, verification of reports and records.	
18	"For the purpose of assuring compliance with record	
19	keeping requirements and verifying reports filed by	
20	handler, the Secretary and the committee through its	
21	duly-authorized employees shall have access to any	
22	premises where applicable records are maintained, where	
23	hops and or hop products are received or held, and at	
24	any time during reasonable business hours shall be	
25	permitted to inspect such handlers, handler premises and	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	

1	any and all records of such handlers with respect to	
2	matters within the purview of this part."	
3	Section 991.63, confidential information. "All reports	
4	and records furnished or submitted by handlers to or	
5	obtained by the employees of the committee which contain	
6	data or information constituting a trade secret or	
7	disclosing the trade position, financial condition, or	
8	business operations of the particular handler from whom	
9	received, shall be treated as confidential, and the	
10	reports and all the information obtained from records	
11	shall at all times be kept in the custody and under the	
12	control of one or more employees of the committee who	
13	shall deliver such information to no person other than	
14	the Secretary."	
15	***	
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Was that disclose?	
17	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Did I yes.	
18	* * *	
19	BY MR. MONAHAN:	
20	Q. First I'll just ask you the general	
21	question. Is there anything unusual or unique about	
22	these sections that was tailored to fit the needs of the	
23	hop industry?	
24	A. There is not.	
25	Q. I want to ask you about Section 991.60A, York Stenographic Services, Inc.	

1	which refers to the handlers' obligation to report
2	inventory. It indicates that the report must include
3	hops which were held by such handler. In the instance
4	of this handler who is renting storage space to a
5	producer, is that going to, in your opinion or at least
6	as you understand it, is that going to constitute
7	inventory held by that handler? Or is that being held
8	by the producer?
9	A. I would interpret that to be held by the
10	producer.
11	Q. Under B, receipts, do I understand that
12	it's the receipts provided by the handler to the
13	commission that will enable the commission to assess the
14	handler?
15	A. That's correct. To the committee.
16	Uh-huh. The handler would supply receipts to the
17	committee showing the quantity of hops that they
18	handled.
19	Q. Okay. And that would have to they'd
20	have to show quantity and variety, would they not?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. Are you able to comment at all, sir, on
23	the purpose of the confidentiality provision?
24	A. Well, just in general the committee is
25	obligated to use the utmost care in making sure that all
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	proprietary information is kept confidential. It's
2	extremely important.
3	***
4	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Christensen. I
5	would yield the floor, Your Honor.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
7	Monahan. Questions on these sections for Mr.
8	Christensen? I'd ask first from those who are here in
9	favor of the proposals.
10	There are none. For those who are here in a
11	position against the proposals. Mr. Moody.
12	***
13	BY MR. MOODY:
14	Q. Just one question, Mr. Christensen.
15	Would the handlers be required to report price
16	information or whether hops are under contract
17	information?
18	A. Under the language in the order now there
19	is the authority to request that kind of information,
20	but it's not specifically indicated now.
21	Q. All right. So the committee would have
22	the power to ask for that information?
23	A. Yes.
24	***
25	MR. MOODY: Thank you.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Are there	
2	additional questions for those contrary to the	
3	proposals? There appear to be none.	
4	Do the representatives of the USDA have any	
5	questions for Mr. Christensen? Ms. Finn.	
6	***	
7	BY MS. FINN:	
8	Q. Why is it necessary to collect this	
9	information from handlers?	
10	A. The committee is charged with the	
11	responsibility of setting a saleable percentage and	
12	saleable quantity each year. In order to do that they	
13	need all available information regarding unsold stocks,	
14	both at the grower and at the handler level to help then	
15	determine needs for additional supplies.	
16	Q. Will this reporting create an extra	
17	burden on the industry?	
18	A. Well, I think that, yeah. I think	
19	there's there will be some additional efforts	
20	required to provide this information. I don't think	
21	I think mostly in terms of the logistical aspects of	
22	getting, collecting the information and providing it to	
23	the committee. The information is available. It	
24	doesn't require additional efforts, I don't think, in	
25	most cases to research and accumulate catalog, if you	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077	

1	will, or chart the information. But obviously there
2	will be a little bit of additional effort required to
3	provide it.
4	Q. Do industry members already file reports
5	with other state agencies or other
6	A. That's my understanding. Yes. Uh-huh.
7	Q. Is there going to be a requirement that
8	growers file reports?
9	A. Again, these are things that the
10	committee will establish as they put together an overall
11	plan for reporting. I would expect that there would be
12	some reports required from growers in terms of acreage
13	and production.
14	Q. As I read through the provisions, I don't
15	see any requirement for growers, so I didn't know
16	since it is a producer allotment program, usually
17	there are some type of
18	A. There are, and usually those will
19	probably be covered under the areas that talk about
20	application for annual allotment that requires certain
21	information from the growers in order to be able to, you
22	know, obtain their annual allotment certificate. That's
23	where that authority comes from.
24	Q. So it's somewhere else in the order
25	that

1	A. Yes.	
2	QI haven't seen yet? Okay.	
3	A. Correct.	
4	***	
5	MS. FINN: Thank you.	
6	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Uh-huh.	
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.	
8	Finn. Ms. Dec.	
9	***	
10	BY MS. DEC:	
11	Q. Just to follow up on Ms. Finn's question,	
12	if there are reports required or if producers are	
13	required to file information or the committee receives	
14	information from producers, that information is is it	
15	the intent of the Proponents that that information would	
16	also be treated as confidential as set forth in Section	
17	63?	
18	A. Absolutely. Yes.	
19	***	
20	MS. DEC: Thank you.	
21	***	
22	BY MR. DESKINS:	
23	Q. Sir, in Section 991.60A, the term	
24	certified report is used. What's what do you mean by	
25	the term, certified?	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077	

I	A. My interpretation of a certified report	
2	is that the committee would ask for some type of	
3	certification on behalf of the handler, whether that be	
4	a signature or a verification that the information is	
5	accurate.	
6	Q. Do you mean the handler's supposed to	
7	self-certify it, or is there another agency that's	
8	supposed to certify it?	
9	A. No. I interpret that that the handler	
10	would self-certify that.	
11	***	
12	MS. DESKINS: I have no further questions.	
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Other	
14	questions? Ms. Finn.	
15	***	
16	BY MS. FINN:	
17	Q. Do the reports that the sub-committee	
18	would develop to use on handlers and growers, would they	
19	have to be approved by the Department?	
20	A. Well, the language does not state that,	
21	and I guess I go back to my answer to the last question,	
22	and that is that, you know, there will be, of course, a	
23	Department representative at all committee meetings and	
24	all sub-committee meetings reviewing these procedures as	
25	they're set up. And so the Department will have the	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077	

1	opportunity to inspect and oversee that entire procedure	
2	and has the right of disapproval of any of those	
3	procedures.	
4	Q. Do you know that the US Department of	
5	Agriculture has to go through the Office of Management	
6	and Budget to report all reporting burdens	
7	A. Yes.	
8	Qto the public?	
9	A. And in that venue, yes, all the forms	
10	developed by the committee, of course, would be	
11	submitted for OMB review and approval.	
12	***	
13	MS. FINN: All right. Thank you.	
14	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Uh-huh.	
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Additional	
16	questions from USDA? No?	
17	***	
18	BY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	
19	Q. Mr. Christensen, I want to make sure I	
20	understand how the committee is going to be able to	
21	determine the saleable if there's no requirement for the	
22	growers to report the inventory they have on hand on	
23	March 1 and September 1.	
24	A. There is authority in the order to	
25	require reports from growers on production levels. The	

1	committee will constantly monitor that production, and	
2	through the handling procedures will also monitor sales,	
3	and therefore, will know what unsold levels of inventory	
4	there are that are held by growers.	
5	· ***	
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.	
7	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Uh-huh.	
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any further	
9	questions for Mr. Christensen on this issue? There are	
10	none. Mr. Monahan.	
11	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Then	
12	we're happy to move ahead to Section 991.70.	
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I think it might	
14	also be a good time for a break, but before we do that,	
15	Mr. Moody.	
16	MR. MOODY: Your Honor and Brendan, I don't	
17	know if Mr. Christensen is going to be in Yakima next	
18	week, I guess he probably is, but there's a number,	
19	aside from the three Oregon growers that we know about,	
20	I think there's a number of other Oregon growers who've	
21	come today to testify, and I just want to make sure they	
22	get a chance to be heard.	
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Let's	
24	do take our break, and I'd ask the two of you to discuss	
25	that while we're off record and see if you can agree to	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077	

_	it when we get back. So please be	
3 roady to go at 3.	ΑЭ	
J ready to go at 3:	ready to go at 3:47.	
4	***	
5 [Tape 4 Side 2]	[Tape 4 Side 2]	
6	* * *	
7 ADMINIS	TRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on	
8 record at 3:48 p.:	m. Mr. Monahan, did you and Mr. Moody	
9 determine how we	might proceed?	
10 MR. MON	AHAN: We both had very good ideas, but	
11 they were differe	nt ideas, Your Honor.	
12 ADMINIS	TRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Let me hear yours.	
13 MR. MON	AHAN: I just want to explain briefly	
14 why I don't think	we were able to come to an agreement.	
15 Throughout the pr	Throughout the process of putting together the proposal	
16 that's the subjec	that's the subject of these hearings the Proponent's	
17 Committee spent a	Committee spent a lot of time soliciting input and	
18 advice from growe	advice from growers from all the states, both pro and	
19 con. And they fi	con. And they firmly believe that this proceeding	
20 should not be any	should not be any different. We should hear from	
21 everybody, both s	ides.	
22 We've t	ried to be as flexible and as	
23 accommodating as	possible to the witnesses, to the	
24 orchestrated pres	entation of the folks in opposition.	
25 At some point in	time, Your Honor, that does end up	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	
34 North C	eorge St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077	

1	compromising the proceedings from our perspective, both		
2	in the ability of the Proponent's Committee to put on a		
3	full and complete presentation and maybe even more		
4	importantly from the ability of the growers to really		
5	get a fair sense of what's going on here. We're looking		
6	at the tail end of day three. We've been outpaced in		
7	terms of presentation by a factor of about three to one.		
8	None of the Oregon growers have yet heard the		
9	Proponent's Committee's positions on volume regulations,		
10	allotment base, annual allotments, excess alpha and pool		
11	requirements. I mean, these are the things that make		
12	the marketing order work. Nobody has the benefit of		
13	that information.		
14	I realize that I sit in the chair of an		
15	advocate, but from our vantage point the reason that so		
16	much time has been consumed by the opposition is that		
17	they've chosen to use the time allotted for cross		
18	examination to argue the theory of the case and to		
19	trumpet what they see to be the benefits of an		
20	unregulated free market system.		
21	That's a fine strategy, but the consequence is		
22	they consume value hearing time, arguably at the expense		
23	of persons that they would parade up to support their		
24	position.		
25	Now, I'm not suggesting that the Oregon		
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.		
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077		

1	growers pay the price for the strategies emproyed by the
2	folks in opposition. I'm mainly expressing frustration.
3	I would ask that Mr. Christensen be allowed to complete
4	his testimony and then we go forward with grower
5	testimony, Your Honor.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Now, do you have
7	any growers that need to testify today in favor of the
8	proposal?
9	MR. MONAHAN: We did not bring them here. No,
10	Your Honor.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: So they will be in
12	Yakima?
13	MR. MONAHAN: Correct.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Mr.
15	Moody, how many people do you know of that would like to
16	testify today against the proposal?
17	MR. MOODY: There are five Oregon growers who
18	would like to testify today who have indicated they
19	won't be able to travel to Yakima, and if I understand
20	correctly, Mr. Christensen will be in Yakima anyway.
21	And so I would ask, and I realize there's some
22	unfairness to taking people out of line compared to the
23	"regulars" who are here for all days of the hearing, but
24	I would ask that, you know, given the way USDA has
25	scheduled this in two venues, that the people who by
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	their own schedules can't come to Yakima at least have a
2	chance to be heard here today.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
4	you, Mr. Moody. Mr. Christensen, are you going to be
5	available in Yakima?
6	MR. CHRISTENSEN: I will be in Yakima. Yes.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And how many of the
8	days do you intend to be there?
9	MR. CHRISTENSEN: That's uncertain. I know I
10	have to go back and try to make a living sometime but
11	probably one or two days.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. How
13	much more direct testimony would you anticipate Mr.
14	Christensen's time would take if you cover what you want
15	to cover today with him?
16	MR. MONAHAN: Twenty to 25 minutes of direct
17	testimony, Your Honor, depending on how fast he reads.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. That
19	together with cross, which there will be some of, would
20	consume the rest of our time until 5:00. Let's talk
21	about whether we want to go late today. Mr. Moody,
22	you've always been willing to go late. I presume that's
23	still true.
24	MR. MOODY: I'm willing to do so, Your Honor,
25	because of the importance that people who want to be
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

•	neura so heard. In time is the hearing's time.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. What
3	would you estimate the direct testimony of the five
4	witnesses to require in time?
5	MR. MOODY: Ten minutes a piece, under an
6	hour.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Probably cross
8	won't be extensive of them, just based on what we've
9	seen here so far. They tend to have a single point of
0	view, and it's usually quite clear by the time they're
11	done.
12	MR. MOODY: And I'd like to think that it was
13	well-stated as well, Your Honor.
14	MR. MONAHAN: I don't anticipate lengthy cross
15	examinations, however, there's some interesting issues
16	that we would like to get into with a couple of these
17	witnesses.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. Well, I hate
19	to do this to the Proponents, I've allowed you to be
20	trampled on all three days, but I'm going to do it
21	again. Mr. Christensen, you may step down, and we'll
22	see you in Yakima. And Mr. Moody, you may call your
23	first witness.
24	MR. MOODY: Thank you, Your Honor, and John
25	Annen, please.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW GODGE: All right. Let's
2	put the lights back on. Would you state your full name
3	for us and spell your names?
4	MR. ANNEN: John, J-o-h-n, Flavius,
5	F-l-a-v-i-u-s, Annen, A-n-n-e-n.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And I'd like you to
7	raise your right hand so that I can swear you in.
8	* * *
9	[Witness sworn]
10	* * *
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. You'll
12	need to move that microphone closer and scoot your chair
13	a little closer I think. All right. Thank you. Mr.
14	Moody, do you anticipate asking the beginning questions?
15	MR. MOODY: Well, I would defer to Mr. Annen.
16	If he wants to begin with a statement, Mr. Annen, feel
17	free to do so, otherwise, I can just start with
18	questions.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Then
20	before that, Mr. Annen, if you'll tell us a little bit
21	about where you work, what type of crops you grow, and
22	that sort of thing. Give me some indication for your
23	background with hops, and then we'll either have you
24	make your statement or if you prefer, Mr. Moody can ask
25	you questions.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	24 Ni - d. C C. W. d. D. 17401 (717) 064 0077

. .

1	MR. ANNEN: Okay.
2	***
3	JOHN F. ANNEN,
4	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
5	testified as follows:
6	MR. ANNEN: My name is John Annen. I'm a hop
7	grower in Mount Angel, Oregon. I'm a fourth generation
8	grower. We have 400 total acres of farmland, which has
9	260 acres of trellised hops. We currently grow ten
10	different kinds of hops, mostly specialty hops for the
11	Kraft Brewing Industry, as well as some hops for
12	Anheuser-Busch direct. My wife and I own a minority
13	share of Annen Brothers, Incorporated, which I serve a
14	president, day-to-day manager. Annen Brothers
15	Incorporated is also one of the seven partners in Hop
16	Union CBS, and it's where we deliver our craft through
17	Hops Two.
18	I currently serve as the vice-president of Hop
19	Growers America, representing the great State of Oregon.
20	I am the president of the growers' association in
21	Oregon, have been off and on for 12 years, and I'm a
22	commissioner in the State of Oregon.
23	MS. DESKINS: Excuse me, Mr. Annen, I hate to
24	interrupt. Judge Clifton, was he sworn in?
25	MR. MOODY: Yes.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MS. DESKINS: Yes.
2	MR. ANNEN: I said I do.
3	MS. DESKINS: Okay.
4	MR. ANNEN: I will.
5	MS. DESKINS: Okay. We wanted to make sure
6	MR. ANNEN: I swear.
7	MS. DESKINS:of that. There was some
8	concern. Okay. Thank you.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And you're welcome,
10	and I really do appreciate your helping me with that
11	because if I fail to swear in a witness, then what he
12	has said is not evidence. It's just that important. So
13	I'd rather swear him twice, but I remember that I did.
14	All right, sir, so tell me what you're president of
15	again.
16	MR. ANNEN: The Oregon Hop Growers'
17	Association. I'm also a commissioner on the Oregon Hop
18	Commission.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: How many years have
20	you been working with hops as a grower?
21	MR. ANNEN: Forty-six.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: True?
23	MR. ANNEN: Born there.
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Would
25	you like to say what you have to say and then let Mr.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Moody follow up with questions, or would you like for
2	him to start questioning you from the beginning? It's
3	up to you.
4	MR. ANNEN: Oh, I'll say what I have to say.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Very fine. You may
6	proceed.
7	MR. ANNEN: I have some concerns about the Hop
8	Marketing Order. I was part of the committee that
9	helped draft all this stuff from the meetings in Oregon
10	at least, and I kind of got put my concerns down.
l 1	Some of these concerns were raised during the meeting,
12	some are after the fact, and I just figured I'd just
13	kind of go through them.
14	991.04. Hops are clearly defined as, excuse
15	me. Hops are clearly defined as different yet will be
16	regulated the same. I don't think anyone in this
17	industry would argue that aroma hops are not the
18	problems and are in balance. Oregon has no super
19	high-alpha hop option at this time, which is a great
20	disadvantage to us.
21	991.08. After understanding what I
22	understand today I have no desire to be a handler and
23	did not understand that to be part of this whole thing.
24	Preparation of hops for market no matter by whom should
25	be considered as handled. Yearly budgets are projected
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	by the spring-strung acreage and production averages.
2	Financial hardships on the organization could result if
3	any given percent of the strung crop is not assessed.
4	Assessments could be somewhat of a deterrent to growing
5	inventory hops. I think it should be strung, count,
6	harvested, assessed, and then assessed.
7	991.25. With the proposed voting structure
8	Washington and Idaho with similar climate and varietal
9	production could pass policy that may adversely affect
10	the production in Oregon, a large aroma-growing region.
11	The demise of the last order was in part due to greed by
12	the growers setting 135 percent saleable. Perhaps the
13	policy of issues setting of the saleable should have
14	voting members with no financial interest in the
15	industry, percentages set purely on industry numbers.
16	991.26. Keep the language in this proposal
17	that was in the old order that said, takes into account
18	programs when they when deciding where the research
19	and promotion dollars are spent.
20	991.31. Disposition of funds upon termination
21	should be returned to the grower that paid them, not the
22	handler who merely passed the funds through. Also given
23	the economic climate and the industry, the states may
24	have trouble affording both regional and local programs.
25	Monies collected in the state are currently spent as the

1	local growers decide, oftentimes on special needs of the
2	state or region, as well as unforeseen emergencies,
3	pests, or diseases. Also, there is no cap on
4	assessments. Perhaps the 1-1/2 percent of crop value as
5	there is in the State of Oregon.
6	991.51. The ability to increase the saleable
7	during the marketing year would effectively keep Oregon
8	out of an emerging market. It takes at least two years
9	to get a crop in Oregon. The only growers that would
10	take advantage would be those with hop stocks or those
11	that could plant and harvest the same year. There is
12	also a risk that setting a higher saleable in any given
13	year would adversely affect the next crop year's
14	saleable. Too many hops in the market if the advisory
15	committee is wrong.
16	991.52. The alpha acid factor does not enter
t 7	into the aroma hop equation. Aroma hops are sold by the
18	raw hop pound. Setting the saleable according to alpha
19	will severely penalize the grower that produces a higher
20	alpha aroma hop by limiting his production by pounds.
21	In the specialty aroma market often there are only a few
22	growers growing a specific variety for a specific
23	market. As for the excuse me. As for the fact that
24	this will only be set one year at a time, this would
25	preclude aroma growers from the long-standing, forward
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	contracting with Anheuser-Busch, as well as the
2	traditional sold ahead relationships with the major
3	dealers we have worked with in the past. Also, there's
4	the fact of the yearly variations in the alpha acid
5	content.
6	991.53. The proposed representative base period
7	comes after the Oregon growers grub tops [ph] and
8	reflection of market demands and trends. In 1995,
9	Oregon grew 8,641 acres. In 2001, it had dropped to
10	6,103 acres. The flat rate of 10 percent for aroma hops
i 1	will grossly over-inflate the initial allotment base.
12	This will led to further, more drastic cuts in the
13	overall saleable percentage. This is also unfair to the
14	alpha grower who is going to get based on a real alpha
15	basis.
16	New base to new growers is far too
17	restrictive, one half of 1 percent. In the free market
18	system a new grower can enter if a market can be
19	established. New growers should be welcomed if they can
20	grow hops or market hops differently or more cheaply
21	than the existing ones without the added expense of
22	buying base. Innovations by new growers should not be
23	penalized. Those who can no longer grow profitably
24	should not expect those who can to bail them out as for
25	the proposed minimum economic requirement, an
	Voyle Stangaronhia Samiana Ina

1	applicant's ability, area, and other factors. There is
2	such diversity in the states that who will say what the
3	parameters should be. What will work in one area may
4	not work well in another. There is no cookie cutter
5	help branch. Each is as individual as we are.
6	With the inclusion of the reserve pool as a
7	bona fide effort, those with large inventories will be
8	able to market their unneeded production at the expense
9	of the growers who wish to continue to produce.
10	Saleable will be set with those inventories in mind and
11	will have to be lower than it would be otherwise.
12	991.54. Written contracts can exceed a grower
13	allotment. I would propose that contract hops come out
14	of the growers' base allotment. Otherwise this will
15	create a lower saleable percentage through that contract
16	period.
17	991.56. Reserve pool alpha could be grown and
18	stored with no limits, then marketed out in subsequent
19	years under the bona fide effort requirement with the
20	grower no longer taking any growing risks. If
21	inventories must be included in the saleable percentage
22	calculations every year, fresh hops will be further
23	limited.
24	991.78. Should the vote to terminate not be
25	the same as there is to vote it in, either by the number
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	of people or production, this states that the Secretary
2	can terminate by a super majority. I think that
3	whatever way it is voted in is the way it should be
4	voted out.
5	991.79. Secretary can terminate the
6	continuance review with findings that growers are not in
7	favor of it. There are no set rules on the number of
8	growers or how long they've been growers or if they want
9	to continue to be growers.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Wow. Mr. Moody.
1	MR. MOODY: Thank you. That was
12	comprehensive.
13	***
14	BY MR. MOODY:
15	Q. Let me begin by just I don't know if
16	you were in the room and heard Mr. Gasseling testify
17	that in his view there was a consensus among the Oregon
18	growers, and I don't mean to I hope I'm not
19	misquoting him, but I understood him to say there was a
20	consensus among the Oregon growers as to the need for a
21	marketing order. If you were here, Mr. Annen, do you
22	recall that
23	A. Yes. I heard Mr. Gasseling's statement.
24	Q. Okay. As president of the Oregon
25	Growers' Association do you have an opinion on that?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. There is a strong consensus from the
2	growers of Oregon that something needs to be done with
3	this industry. There's a strong consensus of the Oregon
4	growers that the problem mainly lies in Washington with
5	the super alpha hops. There has never been an
6	overwhelming majority of growers in favor of a marketing
7	order in the State of Oregon as proposed.
8	Q. All right. Have the Oregon growers come
9	together in achieving a consensus on the "something"
10	that must be done?
11	A. We at the on the Growers'
12	Association level we did not have 100 percent either for
13	or against. We have one grower that I personally know
14	who's undecided and two that are for, so we have come to
15	not made an official statement.
16	Q. And how many or what percentage of the
17	Oregon growers are against the order as proposed?
18	A. I believe we have 38 numbers, so it would
19	be 35, 34.
20	Q. Okay. So that's one in favor, two
21	unsure. Oh, one or two in favor, one
22	A. One unsure that I know of for sure.
23	Q. Okay. And then about approximately 35
24	opposed.
25	A. Correct.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Q. And would the general opposition reflect
2	generally the points that you have summarized?
3	A. Yeah. I talked with the guys as best I
4	could when I was throwing these notes together, and this
5	is these are my personal opinions but influenced by
6	the input from the other growers I chatted with.
7	Q. All right. Just to flush out one of your
8	points, if I understood, what I think you said is that
9	since base is handed out on the pounds of acid, that the
10	growers up in Washington who are growing the super-high
11	alpha acid varieties would get an unfair amount of base
12	compared to the majority of the Oregon growers who are
13	growing aroma hops?
14	A. Yes, sir. In my opinion, as well as the
15	growers in Oregon who grow nugget, that's our only high
16	alpha hop. We have no super alpha hop. Our nuggets'
17	average yield is 21, 2,200 pounds at 13-1/2 percent
18	alpha and a super alpha hop in the State of Washington,
19	as my understanding, can go 3,000 pounds at 16 percent
20	alpha.
21	Q. Okay. So as one of the consequences of
22	that unfairness that in the first years of operation of
23	the order even though aroma hops in Oregon are generally
24	in balance, that the saleable would be cut so low
25	because the base is so high that you might be facing a

1	situation where you could only market half of your crop
2	A. Personally on our ranch I did the
3	numbers. Anything, any saleable set lower than 85
4	percent will create us at Annen Brothers Incorporated,
5	will make a situation where we have to buy base.
6	Q. All right. And the people you'd be
7	buying it from would be these high alpha acid growers up
8	in Washington?
9	A. I would assume so. Yes, sir.
10	Q. And did you also understand that once the
11	order got going, that since new base, the 1 percent new
12	base only becomes available when the saleable is going
13	up, that the chances are that in years two and forward
14	there might not be any new base at all for you to share
15	in?
16	A. Yes, sir.
17	Q. So you'd be unable to expand at that
18	point.
19	A. Unless we were to purchase additional
20	base.
21	Q. Now, do you have an opinion on the base,
22	the years to accumulate base are proposed from '97, to
23	'02? You'd pick your highest year from among that
24	production. Do you have an opinion about that provision
25	of the marketing order?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. Yes, sir. I think that for everybody to
2	pick their best year and any given year within six, will
3	further grossly over-inflate the initial base allotment.
4	Q. All right. Do you think the actual
5	producers in '03, not only the new producers in '03,
6	only, but people who've been prior producers but their
7	'03, production should also be counted in an opportunity
8	to earn base?
9	A. I feel that when, if and when the vote
10	comes, it should be the base should be calculated on
11	the last growing, the most recent growing year.
12	Q. Oh, so if there's a marketing order, if
13	USDA were to approve this for a vote, you think that the
14	base year should be only '03?
15	A. Only the last year.
16	Q. All right.
17	A. We have a bit of a unique situation that
18	makes my opinion that way, is that since 1995, we have
19	converted 100 percent of our acreage over to we used
20	to be 65 percent alpha, 35 percent aroma. We now have
21	65 the only alphas went out, and we've changed
22	everything over into specialty varieties as well as
23	glamet [ph] for Anheuser-Busch.
24	So in Oregon the first year is a baby year. You get
25	absolutely nothing. The next year is depending on
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

l	variety between half and three-quarters of a crop, and
2	it's the third year until you finally get going. So any
3	given year for us from '95, '97, to 2002, we had between
1	ten and 50 acres of babies in any given year.

- Q. All right. You indicated that high, super-high alpha acid varieties in Washington were not available to you in Oregon. Why is that?
- A. I misspoke. The root stock is available. Two growers in the State of Oregon had planted them.

 One field was planted for three years, the other for two. Our weather is not conducive to super alpha production. The yields in year one were, of course, nothing. I can speak for personal on our own ranch. The yields for year one were nothing. The yield for year two was nothing. We didn't pick it. There wasn't enough there to run through the picker, and year three was three and a half bales.
- Q. All right. For -- if the order were to go forward, one of the things the Secretary has to do is determine a representative period. I would -- I use the term record date, but in order to figure out who gets to vote, the Secretary has to figure out, you know, what year you grew hops for purposes of getting to vote in the referendum. And I know we haven't heard the Proponents on that yet, but do you have an opinion about York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	what year producers ought to get to vote?
2	A. In the most recent crop year.
3	Q. Only. Is that correct?
4	A. Only.
5	Q. Okay.
6	***
7	MR. MOODY: I think that's it for now, Mr.
8	Annen. Thank you very much.
9	MR. ANNEN: Thank you.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
11	Moody. Additional questions from those who are here in
12	a position against the proposal? There are none.
13	Questions for those who are here in favor of
14	the proposal? Mr. Monahan.
15	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, I unfortunately was
16	not able to take notes as quickly as Mr. Annen could
17	speak, and I think that a comprehensive and full cross
18	examination is going to require a copy of the notes. If
19	there are indeed notes that you brought with you.
20	MR. ANNEN: I have an outline.
21	MR. MONAHAN: Could is there could we
22	get a list of that?
23	MR. ANNEN: It's got scribbling on it.
24	MR. MONAHAN: Well, I'll editorialize and say
25	a lot of the points you made, I think, are things that
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	the Proponent's Committee actually agrees with and are
2	helpful to the process.
3	MR. ANNEN: I know that Steve had been
4	E-mailed a copy of this, and I think Leslie has one.
5	MR. MONAHAN: Is there could we take a few
6	minutes and get a copy, Your Honor?
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Let's see first of
8	all if you all have a copy with you.
9	MR. ANNEN: No. This was
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Nobody does?
11	MR. ANNEN:E-mailed a long time ago, Your
12	Honor,
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh, okay. All
14	right.
15	MR. MONAHAN: The reason I bring it up, Your
16	Honor, is that one of the frustrating parts is to have
17	to respond to critiques of provisions that we've not had
18	an opportunity to present on yet.
19	MR. ANNEN: Well, is
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr
21	MR. ANNEN: I took them off of excuse me,
22	Your Honor.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Let me ask you, Mr.
24	Annen, Yakima is about three hours from here.
25	MR. ANNEN: Yes.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Is that correct?
2	MR. ANNEN: Yes. From Portland, four from
3	home.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: About four from
5	home? Could you make yourself available on any day next
6	week in Yakima?
7	MR. ANNEN: Wednesday or Thursday.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That's what I'd
9	really like to do. I was so unable to grasp everything
10	you said that what I'd really like is a transcript of
11	it, actually, but I think if you could make yourself
12	available for cross examination in Yakima, and we could
13	go to the next witness
14	MR. ANNEN: Okay.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:who's here with
16	you today or just here today, that might be the most
17	efficient use of our time.
18	MR. ANNEN: Okay.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Could you go to the
20	business office here and acquire some photocopies of
21	your notes?
22	MR. ANNEN: Yes, ma'am.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Could you get six
24	of them made?
25	MR. ANNEN: Yes, ma'am.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That would be
2	great.
3	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, before we do that,
4	do have some general questions I would like to ask that
5	I don't think are dependent upon the notes.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. You
7	may.
8	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	***
10	BY MR. MONAHAN:
11	Q. Mr. Annen, again, Brendan Monahan for th
12	Proponent's Committee.
13	A. How are you doing?
14	Q. I'm doing fine, thanks. How are you?
15	A. It's easier being back there giggling
16	than up here.
17	Q. I'll see if I can't make you giggle up
18	here. You through one of your legal entities are an
19	owner in Hop Union. Is that right?
20	A. Yes, sir.
21	Q. Would that make Mr. Smith one of your
22	business partners?
23	A. Yes, sir, he is.
24	Q. He described for us the other day the
25	business model employed by Hop Union. Were you here for

1	his testimony?
2	A. Yes, sir, I was.
3	Q. Did you think he accurately described
4	A. Yes, sir, he did.
5	Qthe manner in which Hop Union conducts
6	its business?
7	A. Yes, sir.
8	Q. The way it actually limits and restricts
9	the amount of hop and hop products that its members or
10	producers may deliver?
11	A. Yes, sir. That we may deliver. Yes.
12	Q. Okay. And are you one of those member
13	producers?
14	A. Yes, sir, we are.
15	Q. Every year what varieties do you
16	deliver to Hop Union?
17	A. Several.
18	Q. Can you tell me what those are?
19	A. No, sir.
20	Q. And each year Hop Union tells you how
21	much you can deliver. Is that right?
22	A. Yes. We have an owner meeting and goes
23	through the hop pounds that were sold by variety, and
24	then the sales team gives us an idea of what they
25	anticipate they can sell, and we come up with a number
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	that the growers can deliver.
2	Q. So the sales team actually goes out and
3	tries to calculate or ascertain demand. Right?
4	A. I would assume so. Yes.
5	Q. And then
6	A. They come to a number.
7	Qit matches once it determines that
8	demand, then it goes ahead and informs the producers,
9	providers what the supply is going to be. Correct?
10	A. Yes, sir.
11	Q. And that model works well, does it not?
12	A. Fairly well. Yes. So far.
13	Q. Something you've invested your money in
14	and believe in?
15	A. Yes, sir.
16	Q. Okay. You talked about if I wrote, if
17	my notes were correct, you indicated that an
18	overwhelming majority of the Oregon hop growers does not
19	support the Hop Marketing Proposal in its present form.
20	Is that accurate?
21	A. Yes, sir.
22	Q. And you obviously went point by point
23	through a lot of provisions that you thought could be
24	improved.
25	A. Yes, sir.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Q. If there were some of these improvements
2	that you identified, do you think that would sway, for
3	example, your support?
4	A. I can only speak for myself.
5	Q. Okay. Would it sway your support, sir?
6	A. Without the volume limitations, yes.
7	Q. Okay. Have you taken have you
8	inquired of other growers as to whether there are
9	modifications to some of the items that you brought up
10	that would change their vote?
11	A. I would let them speak for themselves.
12	Q. One of the things you did bring up as a
13	concern was that by giving all aroma hops or rather all
14	hops with less than 10 percent alpha, a presumed 10
15	percent alpha for initial allotment purposes
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Qthat that would inflate the base.
18	A. I believe it would.
19	Q. And the greatest inflation of base,
20	obviously, would occur for those persons who grow aroma
21	hops.
22	A. Some of them.
23	Q. Well, most of them, would it not? In
24	fact, that's where the inflation would occur.
25	A. In the aroma. Yeah.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Q. Right. And 65 percent of the Oregon hop
2	industry is aroma, is it not?
3	A. I don't have a stat sheet, but I would
4	assume that all of that. Yes.
5	Q. I thought I was quoting you, sir.
6	A. That was on our ranch.
7	Q. Okay. That's your ranch. I'm sorry.
8	A. Yes, sir.
9	Q. Okay. The majority of the Oregon
10	well, I'll back up. Super alpha hops are not really
11	susceptible to the growing climate and conditions we
12	have in Oregon, are they?
13	A. Super alpha hops have not grown or worked
14	for us on our ranch and one other grower's ranch.
15	Q. It's a fair statement that most of the
16	Oregon market does grow aroma hops.
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Okay. And so when we talk about this
19	inflation of the allotment base, it is going to occur,
20	if we were to compare between Washington and Oregon,
21	primarily in Oregon or to a greater effect in Oregon.
22	Is that right?
23	A. Uh-huh.
24	Q. And as a result Oregon is more likely to
25	recapture or gain market share as opposed to Washington.

1	Isn't that right	ht?
2	Α.	I don't know.
3	Q.	Have you ever thought that through?
4	Α.	No.
5	Q.	Is that something Oregon growers would
6	support?	
7	Α.	I have no idea.
8	Q.	At any point in time during your
9	stewardship as	is it president of Oregon Hop
10	Commission? D	id I get that right?
11	Α.	No, sir. President, Oregon Growers'
12	Association.	
13	Q -	Growers' Association. Did the Growers'
14	Association at	any point in the development of this
15	proposal do a	straw poll of support?
16	Α.	Yes, sir.
17	Q.	How did that turn out, sir?
18	Α.	It was almost even, almost split.
19	Q.	Are cascades an aroma hop?
20	Α.	It is my understanding that cascade hop
21	is a dual-purp	ose hop. Depending on the brewery some
22	classify it ar	oma, some classify it bitter. Cascade is
23	an almost t	here's very few acres of cascade in the
24	ground in Oreg	jon.
25	Q.	Is the supply and demand of cascades
		York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 No	orth George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	balanced in your opinion?
2	A. I have no opinion on it, because I'm not
3	in the cascade market.
4	Q. Okay. I'll see you Wednesday.
5	A. Okay.
6	***
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Let me see what
8	other questions people want to ask today. Are there any
9	others from the Proponents that you'd like to ask today?
10	There being none, are there any questions that USDA
11	would like to ask today, understanding that you'll have
12	another opportunity next week?
13	MS. DESKINS: Well, we do want to get some
14	clarification.
15	***
16	BY MS. DESKINS:
17	Q. Mr. Annen, did you put in proposal number
18	11, which was that says delete Sections 991.50
19	through 991.58 from the Hop Marketing Order Proponent's
20	Committee proposal?
21	A. In the letter that was sent before the
22	hearings?
23	Q. Yes.
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Okay. So you are testifying today here
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	in support of proposal number 11, which is what I just
2	read?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Okay.
5	***
6	MS. DESKINS: I have no further questions.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.
8	Deskins. Any other questions today from representatives
9	of USDA? No. All right.
10	The notes that you have that you're going to
11	duplicate, will they pretty much be able to be followed
12	do you think?
13	MR. ANNEN: Yes, ma'am.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. That'll
15	be a big help. All right. If he makes six copies of
16	those, well, let me see your hands if you need a copy
17	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Your Honor, can I ask Steve
18	or Leslie a question real quick? If they I just
19	wondered, do you guys have a clean copy? Can you get
20	them E-mailed here? Because this one's all full of
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay.
22	UNKNOWN SPEAKER:thank you, Leslie.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Very good. That's
24	a big help. All right. So Mr. Roy, you're going to
25	E-mail a clean copy to Mr. Smith, and then all right.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Great.
2	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. Then let's,
4	while you're doing that, we'll go forward then with the
5	next witness. Thank you. You may step down.
6	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't Doug has his
7	computer here.
8	MR. MOODY: Your Honor.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes.
10	MR. MOODY: If I could just ask a couple of
11	follow-up questions to Mr. Monahan's questions. They'll
12	be in contiguous in the record.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. You
14	may, Mr. Moody.
15	MR. MOODY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
16	Annen.
17	* * *
18	BY MR. MOODY:
19	Q. Mr. Monahan asked you a couple of
20	questions about Hop Union and the business model they
21	follow there. And I think he wants to make an analogy
22	that planning is it's good for you, it's good for the
23	whole industry. Would you distinguish just briefly the
24	business model followed at Hop Union from the business
25	model proposed in the Hop Marketing Order?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. Well, I think that the hop union business
2	model is wholly different than the industry as a whole,
3	because we deal with very, very specific varieties, we
4	grow them for very specific breweries, and it's, you
5	know, we grow what they ask for kind of a thing. It's
6	not just a general grow hops and try to guess the demand
7	kind of thing.
8	Q. Do you have any reason to believe that
9	eight members of the hop administrative committee would
10	be as good at anticipating demand as the business model
11	you follow at Hop Union?
12	A. Again, our model is real structured. I
13	would hate to be one of the eight gentlemen asked to be
14	on that committee. That's like being the almighty, and
15	you can we're only human. We can make mistakes, and
16	I think it's very dangerous to have eight people making
17	business decisions for the entire industry.
18	Q. All right. And also one other exception
19	at Hop Union. Whatever it is you decide to grow and
20	whatever varieties you decide to grow and whether you
21	decide to expand or contract, you don't have to go get
22	base from somebody else in order to achieve that
23	business goal.
24	A. No, sir. And in fact, if Hop Union only
25	needs three quarters of our production, there are one

1	I know of one other outlet that may be interested in
2	them, so we may, in fact, not have to contract.
3	Q. Right. Mr. Monahan also asked you
4	questions about inflated base, and he was talking about
5	the 10 percent guaranteed base or 10 percent guaranteed
6	alpha acid factor for whatever your hops happened to be.
7	Isn't the other reason there'd be the base,
8	additional base pool would be so unreasonably high or
9	the primary reason it'd be so unreasonably high isn't
10	because of that 10 percent factor. It's because with
11	people allowed to choose their high year from among six,
12	that it's that provision of the marketing order that's
13	going to produce the totally unrealistic base, not the
14	10 percent guaranteed factor?
15	A. Yes, sir.
16	Q. Okay. Mr. Monahan asked you about the
17	straw poll that you took and
18	A. Yes, sir.
19	Qwhere people were almost split.
20	A. Yes, sir.
21	Q. What that was some time ago?
22	A. That was quite awhile ago.
23	Q. Okay. And since your testimony that
24	approximately 35 of the members or a little over 90
25	percent were opposed, that's a more recent

I	A. Yes.
2	Qstraw poll?
3	A. Yes, sir.
4	Q. Okay. And that
5	A. That wasn't a physical straw poll, sir.
6	That was a conversation that all the growers had after a
7	meeting that was held in the first week in August in
8	Salem.
9	Q. Okay. The first week in August
10	A. Yes, sir.
11	Q'03. Okay. So that
12	A. Yes, sir.
13	Qrepresents the current view of your
14	membership.
15	A. Yes, sir.
16	Q. Okay.
17	***
18	MR. MOODY: Thanks very much, Mr. Annen.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any other follow-up
20	questions to what Mr. Monahan asked?
21	Mr. Monahan, any follow up to what Mr. Moody
22	asked?
23	MR. MONAHAN: Just, sir, I apologize when I
24	was asking for the varieties that you deliver to Hop
25	Union. I didn't want to get into your personal affairs
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	or proprietary information.
2	***
3	BY MR. MONAHAN:
4	Q. What I meant to ascertain was if they
5	were the type of varieties that in Mr. Smith's pie chart
6	came under the 3 percent of other.
7	A. Yes, sir.
8	Q. They're the minor varieties that are
9	usually dedicated to a particular brewer.
10	A. Yes, sir.
11	Q. And in the event that you do produce more
12	than Hop Union tells you that it can or is inclined to
13	purchase, you often have no other outlet for those
14	specified varieties.
15	A. No, sir. There is one other outlet that
16	I know for sure.
17	Q. Okay. And that can always take up all of
18	your surpluses?
19	A. I don't know. We only planted so far to
20	what we need, so we haven't had an overage yet.
21	***
22	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
24	Monahan. What days will you be in Yakima, Mr. Annen?
25	MR. ANNEN: I will be there Thursday and
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Friday. Wednesday, excuse me, Your Honor. Wednesday,
2	Thursday, and Friday.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Wednesday,
4	Thursday, and Friday. I really appreciate that. Thank
5	you very much.
6	MR. ANNEN: Thank you.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may step down.
8	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, could we take a
9	straw poll of the other four growers here and see if
10	perhaps they might make it to Yakima as well?
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. If
12	you're one of the other four that would like to testify
13	today, could you come I don't know if we can get the
14	microphone on the podium to work, but could you stand at
15	the podium for a minute? We'll see if we can get that
16	mic to work. Would one of you put the button on that's
17	on the top of it?
18	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, Your Honor.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Try the one on the
20	podium and see if it works now. They just plugged
21	something in.
22	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's working.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. Good. Would
24	each of you speak your name into the microphone and
25	spell your name for us?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

```
1
                  MR. VANDENEYNDE: Peter M. Vandeneynde,
2
       P-e-t-e-r, M., Van, V-a-n-d-e-n-e-y-n-d-e.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And Vandeneynde is
3
4
       all one word?
                  MR. VANDENEYNDE: Yes.
5
6
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
7
       you. And if each of you would do that in turn, please.
                  MR. BUTSCH: Jeff Butsch, J-e-f-f, J is the
8
9
       middle name, B-u-t-s-c-h.
10
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
                  MR. FOBERT: Paul W. Fobert, P-a-u-l, W.,
11
12
       F-o-b-e-r-t.
13
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
14
                  MR. KERR: Andrew C. Kerr, A-n-d-r-e-w, C.,
15
       K-e-r-r.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
16
17
        about 4:30. I would like to close at 5:00 or as soon
        thereafter as we can, but I don't want to miss any of
18
19
        your testimony. We plan to be in Yakima, Washington,
        every day next week, 8:30 to 5:00. Which of you needs
20
21
        to testify today and will not be appearing in Yakima?
22
        If you will come to the microphone and state that.
                  MR. KERR: Andrew Kerr. I won't be able to
23
24
        make it to Yakima.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
25
                         York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

1	MR. VANDENEYNDE: Peter Vandeneynde, I will
2	not be able to get to Yakima.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
4	MR. FOBERT: Paul Fobert. I could possibly
5	make it if there's no time today.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
7	MR. BUTSCH: Your Honor, if there's no time
8	today I could probably make it.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I will
10	attempt to get all four of you in today, but I would
11	like to start with the two that have to testify here or
12	not be heard. So between Mr. Vandeneynde and Mr. Kerr,
13	which one of you would like to go first?
14	All right. Just one moment. I'll get my
15	witness identified. No. I'm sorry. I'm telling the
16	court reporter a moment before he changes the tape.
17	Your name again? Thank you. We'll go off record to
18	change the tape at 4:31.
19	***
20	[Tape 5 Side 1]
21	***
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
23	you. We're back on record at 4:32. Mr. Vandeneynde is
24	now seated to my left, and he does have copies. This is
25	excellent. May we keep all these?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	MR. VANDENEYNDE: Yes.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I'm
3	going to have the court reporter mark one of these as
4	Exhibit 23 and take that and a duplicate of it, the
5	duplicate being for the assistance of the typist who
6	transcribes, and then with regard to the remainder,
7	there are enough here for people in the back to have
8	copies, as well as those in the front.
9	Mr. Monahan, would you take care of the people
10	on your side of the room, and Ms. Deskins, would you
i 1	take care of the people on your side of the room? Thank
12	you. Let's go off record while these are distributed at
13	4:33.
14	***
15	[Off the record]
16	[On the record]
17	***
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We're
19	back on record at 4:34. Again, Mr. Vandeneynde, would
20	you state and spell your names and then I'll swear you
21	in.
22	MR. VANDENEYNDE: Yes. Peter M. Vandeneynde,
23	and it's P-e-t-e-r, M., Vandeneynde,
24	V-a-n-d-e-n-e-y-n-d-e.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Would you raise
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	your right hand, please?
2	***
3	[Witness sworn]
4	***
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Before
6	you read your statement into the record would you tell
7	me where you grow hops, what your involvement in the
8	industry is in general, how long you've been involved,
9	that type of information, please?
10	MR. VANDENEYNDE: All right. I am an employee
11	of John I. Haas, Incorporated, and we grow hops in
12	Oregon and Washington. My role with the company is the
13	hop purchasing agent in the State of Oregon, and I don't
14	know if I stated, I've been with the company for 32
15	years.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And how many of
17	those years have you been involved in purchasing hops?
18	MR. VANDENEYNDE: The entire time.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Have you ever grown
20	hops?
21	MR. VANDENEYNDE: No, ma'am.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Is
23	there anything else about your affiliations within
24	Oregon, where you live and work that you could share
25	with us?
	Vork Stonggraphic Company Inc.

1	MR. VANDENEYNDE: I work in Salem, Oregon, and
2	are at the John I. Haas office. I'm also the dealer
3	representative for the Oregon Hop Commission.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
5	you. You may read your statement.
6	MR. VANDENEYNDE: All right.
7	***
8	PETER M. VANDENEYNDE,
9	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
10	testified as follows:
11	MR. VANDENEYNDE: Our chief executive officer,
12	Henry von Eichel, asked me to serve as a messenger to
13	bring his statement that he authored and posted on the
14	Internet.
15	MS. DESKINS: Your Honor, I hate to interrupt,
16	but what he has there isn't his statement, it's somebody
17	else's statement. Could you ask him to read his? Does
18	he have his own statement today that he's going to read?
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may answer that
20	question.
21	MR. VANDENEYNDE: No, I do not.
22	MS. DESKINS: Your Honor, since this isn't his
23	statement, I don't know that he needs to read it into
24	the record.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Do you
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	think it would be better if we just allow him to submit
2	it as an exhibit?
3	MS. DESKINS: I think so, because it's not his
4	statement. That person's not here. I don't know what
5	else I don't know there's any point in reading it.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
7	you, Ms. Deskins. Would you be able to be cross
8	examined on what your coworker has asked you to deliver
9	to us?
10	MR. VANDENEYNDE: No, ma'am.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Then it
12	does make sense to receive it as an exhibit, one that
13	has not been subject to cross examination. I've marked
14	that exhibit as 23. I'd now allow anyone who would like
15	to voir dire the witness about the exhibit and the
16	origin of it to do so.
17	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, the only comment I'd
18	make is that we deferred our witnesses and have
19	rearranged our schedule for the purpose of hearing from
20	Oregon growers, not the John I. Haas Company, which does
21	have offices in Yakima, I believe.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
23	you. Your comment is noted, but I will allow us to
24	proceed here. Does anyone else want to ask any more
25	about the statement?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	I'd like to yes. Mr. Roy.
2	***
3	BY MR. ROY:
4	Q. Mr. Vandeneynde, you indicated this
5	exhibit was posted on the Internet. Could you explain
6	how it was posted or where it was posted?
7	A. Yes. It was posted on USA Hops web site
8	under the hop net message board, and it was posted on
9	the September 5, 2003.
10	Q. And is that bulletin board open to all
11	people?
12	A. I believe it is.
13	Q. So it's not passworded or anything?
14	A. I don't think so.
15	***
16	MR. ROY: Thank you.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
18	tell me again who the author of the statement is.
19	MR. VANDENEYNDE: The author is Henry von
20	Eichel. He is the chief executive officer of John I.
21	Haas Incorporated.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And how
23	is his last name spelled?
24	MR. VANDENEYNDE: Last name is v-o-n and
25	E-i-c-h-e-l.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And what is your
2	working relationship with him?
3	MR. VANDENEYNDE: I am a subordinate employee
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
5	you. Mr. Roy.
6	***
7	BY MR. ROY:
8	Q. Does John I. Haas have any farming
9	operations in Oregon?
10	A. We did. We're in the process of closing
11	a farm.
12	***
13	MR. ROY: Okay.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Is
15	there any objection to the admission into evidence of
16	Exhibit 23? There being none, Exhibit 23 is hereby
17	admitted into evidence.
18	Is there anything further that you would like
19	to state for the record?
20	MR. VANDENEYNDE: No, Your Honor.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Thank
22	you. You may step down. You may keep that copy.
23	Ms. Deskins, thank you for that suggestion.
24	That saved considerable time. Are those extras, Mr.
25	Monahan? Extra copies?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

MR. MONAHAN: We have Mr. Annen's notes now,
Your Honor.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh, I see. Good.
All right. If you'd approach me with those. All right.
Good. I'm going to mark Mr. Annen's statement as
Exhibit 24. And it I'm not going to admit it into
evidence at this point. I'm just going to mark it as
Exhibit 24, and we'll deal with admitting it into
evidence when we get to Yakima, but I'm going to keep
the record copy, and I at this time would like to have
Government take a copy.
MR. ROY: Your Honor.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Roy.
MR. ROY: If Mr. Annen is here, I would love
to have him look at that to make sure it's the right
E-mail.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That wasn't on the
record. Mr. Annen, would you come to the microphone,
please? Mr. Annen, you remain under oath. Could you
identify the document that I've marked as Exhibit 24?
MR. ANNEN: Yes, Your Honor. It's the copy of
the this is an updated copy of the E-mail that I sent
to Leslie and to Steve, because in my when I had my
presentation, I had not said everything that was in it.
So this copy, Mike, Mr. Mike Smith helped me change in
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	the business office, and it is as it was presented.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
3	Excellent. Now, who still needs a copy? Raise your
4	hand, please.
5	MR. ROY: Your Honor, you can E-mail me or
6	Mike can E-mail it back to me. Thanks.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. That
8	takes care of Proponent's Committee. Who else needs a
9	copy still? These are extra? Okay. Let me have the
10	Government representatives take those. Excellent. I
11	thank you so much, Mr
12	MR. ANNEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:Annen. We'll
14	see you in Yakima.
15	All right. Then I would let me just make a
16	note. What was Exhibit 22? Did I admit that into
17	evidence?
18	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I hope so, Your Honor.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I don't think I
20	did. Is there any objection to the admission into
21	evidence of Dr. Kloth's statement, which I marked as
22	Exhibit 22? There being none, Dr. Kloth's statement is
23	hereby admitted into evidence.
24	Mr. Kerr, would you come forward, please?
25	MR. GASSELING: Your Honor, I have one
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	question. On this statement by Mr. von Eichel, does Mr.
2	Vandeneynde know whether Mr. von Eichel is going to be
3	in Yakima next week and could testify on this document?
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: If you'd come to
5	the microphone, please. And for the record that was Mr.
6	Gasseling asking the question. Would you state your
7	name again, please?
8	MR. VANDENEYNDE: Yes. Peter Vandeneynde, and
9	in answer to your question, Mr. Gasseling, I have no
10	idea. I don't from talking with him I don't believe
11	he will be.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Would
13	you invite him? Would you tell him that we'd definitely
14	like to hear from him in person, and we'd like to have
15	participants have the opportunity to ask him questions
16	about his statement if he can make it.
17	MR. VANDENEYNDE: Okay. I'll pass that along.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thanks so much.
19	MR. VANDENEYNDE: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You're welcome.
21	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Your Honor, if we could have
22	Andy Kerr.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes. Mr. Kerr,
24	would you state your full name and spell it for us?
25	MR. KERR: Andrew C. Kerr, A-n-d-r-e-w, C.,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	K-e-r-r.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right, sir. Is
3	your statement written?
4	MR. KERR: Yes.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. How
6	many copies do you have?
7	MR. KERR: A dozen.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh, bless you. I
9	appreciate it so much. I want to mark that as Exhibit
10	25, and let me take would you hand these, Mr. Kerr,
11	to the court reporter? That's the official record copy,
12	and a copy for the typist. Now, with regard to the
13	remaining copies, I'm going to ask, let's see, Mr.
14	Monahan and Ms. Deskins, if you could distribute those.
15	All right. Thank you, Mr. Carswell.
16	Let's go off record while those are
17	distributed.
18	***
19	[Off the record]
20	[On the record]
21	***
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We're
23	back on record now at 4:48. Mr. Kerr, I appreciate very
24	much you bringing those copies of your statement. I'd
25	like you to raise your right hand now, and I'll swear
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

l	you in.
2	***
3	[Witness sworn]
4	***
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Now,
6	before you read your statement to us, would you give us
7	background about your connection with the hops industry?
8	MR. KERR: Sure. I'm a fourth generation
9	grower in the Mid Willamette Valley.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Pull the mic a
11	little closer to you if the Court will allow.
12	MR. KERR: There we go. I'm a fourth
13	generation grower in the Mid Willamette Valley, what
14	would be considered a small operation as far as the hops
15	go, a large operation as far as the general farm is.
16	I'm chair of the Oregon Hop Commission and have been
17	growing hops pretty much all my life.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: How long have you
19	been the chair of the Oregon Hop Commission?
20	MR. KERR: Help. Two terms?
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And how long is
22	each term?
23	MR. KERR: Three oh, one year. I'm sorry.
24	So two consecutive terms.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And were you on
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	the
2	MR. KERR: Two years.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:commission
4	before you became the chair?
5	MR. KERR: Yes, I was.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: How many prior
7	how many years prior to your becoming chair?
8	MR. KERR: Too many. Oh, boy. I'd guess
9	about five.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. Where do you
11	grow hops?
12	MR. KERR: It would be in the Salem area,
13	Salem, Oregon.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And is
15	there anything else about your background that would be
16	helpful for us to know?
17	MR. KERR: Nothing I could think of.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Is
19	there anything that you wanted to add about your
20	statement before you read it?
21	MR. KERR: No.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. You may
23	proceed.
24	***
25	ANDREW C. KERR,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
2	testified as follows:
3	MR. KERR: Thank you for giving me the
4	opportunity to voice my displeasure with the idea of
5	implementing a Federal Marketing Order. It is my
6	opinion that the proposed marketing order as it is
7	written cannot be implemented in a way that is fair and
8	equitable to the different states or the different
9	farming operations.
10	Oregon has seen a disproportionate reduction
11	in market share over the years in part due to the
12	development of higher-producing, super-alpha varieties
13	that are not suited to Oregon's growing region. This
14	has left us at a disadvantage in the alpha market.
15	At this time there are few new varieties in
16	development suited to our growing region. A market
17	based on pounds of alpha and not acreage would give a
18	definite advantage to one region over another. This
19	would make it difficult to convert these acres to more
20	competitive, super-high alpha varieties, which would
21	level the playing field without facing hardship of
22	acquiring more base allotment. This would put Oregon at
23	a competitive disadvantage.
24	Every grower has responded to market
25	oversupply and reduced pricing in differing ways. Some
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

İ have reduced acreage and diversified into other crops in hopes of returning that acreage to production when the 2 market warrants. Others have grown larger to help 3 spread their fixed costs over larger acreage. No one 4 strategy is better than the other. Reduction in acreage 5 does not mean that that grower is less efficient than 6 one who expanded. A grower who decided to expand is not 7 8 callus to market signals. Both growers have responded in the way best suited to their operation. 9 -- the problem is that a marketing order works one 10 strategy and penalizes another.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In response to an oversupplied, shrinking market, our farm has chosen to reduce our acreage over the years and diversify into other crops. This decrease was done with the idea that we would return to full production once the market had corrected itself and a competitive, super-high alpha variety was developed for our region. Our hop enterprise is at the point that further reduction would make it less than a viable unit. This marketing order would force us to either reduce our acreage further or face financial hardship of acquiring more base allotment. Neither of these options would be fair when combined with our already reduced acreage.

Time will correct the overproduction and oversupply we are facing at this time. When this York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
happens, we hope to be able to grow this enterprise.
 1
        This can only happen without the restrictions of a
2
3
        marketing order.
4
                  With this in mind I hope the USDA will see fit
        not to implement this proposed order.
 5
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
6
        Anything further before I open the floor to questions?
7
8
       Mr. Kerr, anything further from you...
9
                  MR. KERR: No.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: ...before -- all
10
11
        right. Mr. Roy.
12
13
        BY MR. ROY:
14
                       Mr. Kerr, if there was ample base around
        at no price or if it was just ample base around, would
15
        it be a financial hardship to you to acquire it?
16
17
                  Α.
                       Ample base?
18
                  Q.
                       Yeah.
19
                  Α.
                       Free?
20
                  Q.
                       Yeah. Ample base.
21
                       I think it would still restrict my
22
       growth.
                 I mean, my problem is I reduced half my acreage
       or almost half of my acreage well before this allotment
23
       period we're picking, you know, our average...
24
25
                  Q.
                       Uh-huh.
```

1	Ayield. So it would take quite a bit.
2	If it was free, it probably would not create a hardship.
3	***
4	MR. ROY: Okay. Thank you.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr. Roy.
6	Any other questions by those who are in favor of the
7	amendment or the proposal? All right. Questions by
8	those who are contrary to the proposal. Mr. Moody.
9	MR. MOODY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Kerr.
10	* * *
11	BY MR. MOODY:
12	Q. During the past few years has the market
13	made some adjustments in response to the external
14	changes such as the crop in demand by the brewers and
15	the changes in exchange rates?
16	A. Some. Yes.
17	Q. And do you think the market now is more
18	in balance than it was a few years ago?
19	A. Yes, but not completely in balance.
20	Q. And do you think that the free market
21	forces will continue to move the market toward a more
22	balanced supply and demand position?
23	A. It's inevitable.
24	Q. All right. And are you willing to rely
25	on those forces rather than a Federal marketing order to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	achieve a proper balance between supply and demand?
2	A. Yeah. That's what I'd prefer.
3	Q. Okay. And you're primarily an aroma
4	grower?
5	A. No. Actually, I'm primarily an alpha
6	grower.
7	Q. And were you here yesterday when I guess
8	it was Mr. Smith testified there weren't any contracts
9	around? Do you have contracts for your alpha?
10	A. No. I'd prefer not to answer that.
11	Q. Okay. And from your point of view do you
12	see, your marketing situation, do you see a balance in
13	supply and demand?
14	A. Getting fairly close. Yes.
15	Q. Okay. And you on that basis in addition
16	to other bases you've set forth in your statement you
17	oppose instituting a Federal marketing order?
18	A. Yes, I do.
19	Q. And do you see that as if it came into
20	effect it would it risks causing more imbalances than
21	solutions?
22	A. In my own personal operation unless I can
23	get Leslie's free base, yes.
24	***
25	MR. MOODY: All right. Thank you very much,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Mr. Kerr.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
3	Moody. You were referring to Mr. Roy. Is that correct?
4	MR. KERR: Yeah. Sorry.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Carswell.
6	MR. CARSWELL: Yes.
7	***
8	BY MR. CARSWELL:
9	Q. Mr. Kerr, in your statement you referred
10	to some new super, I guess super-high alpha varieties
11	A. Yeah.
12	Qthat are maybe being developed in
13	Oregon. Could you expand on that a little bit?
14	A. Well, there's one promising one that one
15	of the dealers has that is kind of being tried in
16	Oregon, and then there's an ongoing program at the
17	university to also develop super-high alpha varieties.
18	Q. And so at some point in hopefully the
19	near future you would have, you believe, super-high
20	alpha varieties that would grow in Oregon. Is that
21	correct?
22	A. I hope to maintain my competitive edge.
23	Well, not edge but level the playing field.
24	Q. And presuming a Hop Marketing Order in
25	place, substantial cut in the saleable quantity, and York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	presuming that base costs something, that would put you	
2	at a disadvantage in terms of putting in super-high	
3	alphas. Is that correct?	
4	A. I believe so. Yes.	
5	***	
6	MR. CARSWELL: Thank you very much.	
7	MR. KERR: Thank you.	
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.	
9	Carswell. Any other questions from those who are in a	
10	position against the proposal? All right. Any	
11	questions from USDA? Dr. Hinman.	
12	***	
13	BY DR. HINMAN:	
14	Q. Yes. Mr. Kerr, I think you very	
15	helpfully answered I think you anticipated whether	
16	the questions we were religiously asking each grower	
17	about the small and large operation, and we appreciate	
18	that. I just want to make clear that you were referring	
19	to the \$750,000 threshold per grower in total annual	
20	sales, and you said you were a, in terms of a just	
21	hop-related income, you were below that.	
22	A. Correct.	
23	Q. And in terms of all farming income from	
24	all your agricultural sales of all products you were	
25	above that.	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	
	4/1 NIA-MARK 1-AAAAA K.C. Marik 13 A 13 AB1 /3131 O.C.A AA34	

1	A. Correct.
2	Q. Would you be able to and I think we've
3	heard previously that there were 38 growers in Oregon,
4	and if so, would you be able to state even in rough
5	figures the same kind of response generally for those 38
6	growers? Could you say a number, a percent, an
7	approximation of how many fit those same two questions
8	that you just answered?
9	A. Wow.
10	Q. Is it's not possible, feel free
11	A. No.
12	Qto say so.
13	A. Yeah.
14	Q. Okay. Thank you. One other question.
15	You also mentioned, referred to, you know, cost of
16	production, spreading fixed costs over, you know is
17	there any kind of cost or production figure for Oregon
18	hops that you could state generally across all
19	varieties, across all, you know, areas of Oregon, or is
20	that just not possible in terms of total cost per acre,
21	average, industry-wide?
22	A. I believe that it would vary from farm to
23	farm, and I don't have that.
24	***
25	DR. HINMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Roy.
2	MR. MONAHAN: Mr. Roy keeps grabbing the
3	microphone from me. Brendan Monahan. I do have some
4	questions when he's through.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
6	MR. ROY: Sorry, Brendan.
7	***
8	BY MR. ROY:
9	Q. Mr. Kerr, you stated 38 growers in
10	Oregon.
11	A. I did? No, I didn't.
12	Q. Oh, somebody oh, okay. I'm sorry.
13	Mr. Moody. Oh, John Annen. How many okay. Let's
14	rephrase this. How many growers as we are defining it
15	through this process as one grower, one vote, what
16	how many growers would you say are in Oregon?
17	A. I'm still unclear as to how that
18	Q. Okay.
19	Ais working out, and I wouldn't be able
20	to tell you.
21	Q. If what would you think there are
22	given what you understand, the one vote, one grower?
23	A. Oh. You know, I wouldn't venture to
24	guess.
25	Q. How many grower numbers are in Oregon? York Stenographic Services, Inc.

l	A.	Thirty-eight, 37, 38.
2	Q.	And okay. And growers do have
3	multiple	
4	Α.	Correct.
5	Q.	Pardon me?
6	Α.	I believe so. Yes.
7		* * *
8	AD	MINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Multiple what?
9	MR	. ROY: Grower numbers.
10	AD	MINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh.
11		* * *
12	BY MR. ROY:	
13	Q.	So you wouldn't have you wouldn't know
14	how many, I	mean, if you combine them under as we
15	defined them	with no common banking, you know
16	Α.	No. I mean, I only have one so
17	Q.	Okay. All right.
18	Α.	as far as everybody else, I really
19	can't say.	
20	Q.	But you would think that there's not
21	38	
22	Α.	I bet it's pretty close. I bet there's
23	very few tha	t are
24	Q.	Yeah.
25		***

I	MR. ROY: Thanks.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr. Roy.
3	Mr. Monahan.
4	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
5	***
6	BY MR. MONAHAN:
7	Q. Mr. Kerr, I just have some questions to
8	try to fully understand the testimony you did give. We
9	heard from Mr. Annen that there were members of the
10	Oregon grower community who are opposed to the order as
11	written. Would you qualify your position as opposed to
12	the marketing order as written or simply opposed to the
13	concept of a market order at all?
14	A. Somewhere in-between.
15	Q. Okay. I believe some of the
16	modifications that Mr. Annen talked about, if there were
17	some modifications you would may be inclined to
18	support a marketing order?
19	A. Probably not.
20	Q. Okay. So in-between but probably just
21	opposed to a marketing order?
22	A. Yeah.
23	Q. Okay.
24	A. There's no way it would work with my
25	unique situation.
	Varia Stangaranhia Cominga Tun

1	Q. In the second paragraph of your
2	statement, you talk about a disproportionate reduction
3	in market share over the years.
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. Okay. What's Oregon's market share now?
6	A. I don't have the exact figures but just
7	what I was trying to allude to was the fact that the
8	higher yielding, super-high alphas up in Washington, you
9	know, acreage has remained somewhat static but Oregon's
10	alpha percentage has dropped, and Washington's has
11	increased.
12	Q. Right. The Washington growers put super
13	alphas in the ground and were able to enjoy higher
14	yields. Is that right?
15	A. Correct.
16	Q. And the Oregon growers put super alphas
17	in the ground, and they didn't grow very well. Is that
18	a fair statement?
19	A. That's probably correct. Yes.
20	Q. Okay. And one of the big reasons is the
21	wet growing climate in the Willamette Valley?
22	A. Correct.
23	Q. And not only by putting the super alphas,
24	not only do you get more ton per acre, but you get a
25	higher alpha per ton.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. Correct.
2	Q. The last sentence, however, of the second
3	paragraph states that the marketing order would make it
4	difficult to convert acres to more competitive,
5	super-high alpha varieties because you'd have to acquire
6	more base allotment. Do you see that statement there?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. You couldn't convert to super-high alpha
9	varieties unless you developed a super-high alpha
10	variety.
11	A. Shall I put an if and when in there?
12	Q. Perhaps. Yeah.
13	A. Okay.
14	Q. How long has have Oregon growers been
15	trying to develop a super-high alpha?
16	A. I'd guesstimate about five years.
17	Q. Yeah. In fact, they planted tried to
18	plant super-high alphas many years before five years.
19	Isn't that right?
20	A. Not that I'm aware of.
21	Q. Okay. Was there a symphony program, CTZ
22	program in Oregon?
23	A. Not that I'm aware of.
24	Q. Not that you're aware of. Okay. Well,
25	what are the super-high alphas that failed?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. One was, gosh. You know, off the top of
2	my head I can't remember.
3	Q. At this point in time planting super-high
4	alphas in Oregon would be theoretical. That would be a
5	fair way to characterize it?
6	A. Correct.
7	Q. You also stated that now in your opinion
8	that supply and demand appear to be approaching
9	equilibrium.
10	A. With the varieties I have on my farm.
1	Q. Okay. So that the demand for your supply
12	appears to be about right.
13	A. Correct. With my varietal mix.
14	Q. And how many acres have you taken out in
5	the last ten years?
.6	A. Oh, roughly 130.
.7	Q. Okay. So taking out the acreage has
.8	helped you achieve the equality between the supply and
.9	demand?
20	A. No. Actually, I think the market
21	conditions have pretty much done that. I doubt my
22	little bit did much to
23	Q. But, I mean, as the market
24	Atake care of it.
25	Qconditions are what prompted you to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	take out the 135 acres?
2	A. Correct.
3	Q. One of the things that you state in your
4	prepared remarks is that growers have grown larger to
5	help spread their fixed costs over larger acreage. Wer
6	you here for Mr. Smith's testimony?
7	A. Yeah, I believe I was.
8	Q. Okay. Did you hear the dynamic that he
9	talked about where growers were actually losing money
10	per acre and as a response planted more acres?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Is that to that's what you're
13	referring to here?
14	A. Not specifically but
15	Q. That's a phenomena you've witnessed and
16	seen?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Have you engaged in that yourself?
19	A. No, I have not.
20	Q. Okay. You've taken the alternate
21	approach, which is to remove acreage?
22	A. Correct.
23	Q. And you according to your statement
24	those are really the two options available to growers
25	given economic conditions?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. Well, I guess there is a third if you
2	want to remain static and
3	Q. Lose money.
4	A. Yeah. That's one. Or get out
5	altogether. Disregard the spelling errors.
6	Q. I don't want to get into your well,
7	you actually did talk about it. You do grow alpha
8	varieties but not varieties that you would characterize
9	as super-high alpha?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. They'd be varieties that were over 10
12	percent alpha?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. One of the things that you said as a
15	third option, and I just want to follow up on your
16	testimony, is that the third option is for a grower to
17	get out of the hop business altogether.
18	A. I think that was the fourth. The third
19	would have been to stay static.
20	Q. Okay. I'm sorry. So fourth is to get
21	out altogether.
22	A. Uh-huh.
23	Q. Again, did you hear Mr. Smith's testimony
24	about the market that there is for idle hop ranches or
25	idle unused hop machinery and infrastructure?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Would you agree that there is zero market
3	for that?
4	A. Yeah. I would agree with that.
5	***
6	MR. MONAHAN: That's all I have, Your Honor.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
8	Monahan. Do representatives of USDA have questions for
9	Mr. Kerr? No. You can see either just before lunch or
10	just before the end of the day there isn't a lot of
11	cross examination.
12	MR. KERR: Thank you.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
14	Kerr. You may step down. Is there oh, Mr. Moody,
15	did you have something further?
16	MR. MOODY: No, Your Honor. I'm just hoping
17	we can get Jeff Butsch on next.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. First
19	of all, is there any objection to the this is on,
20	isn't it? It's quieter than it used to be. Is there
21	any objection to the admission into evidence of Exhibit
22	24? There being none, Exhibit 24 is hereby admitted
23	into evidence.
24	All right. I would rather go with Mr. Fobert,
25	did I say that right? Would you come forward, please?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Test that mic for just a moment with your voice. If
2	you'd just say five, four, three, two, one.
3	MR. FOBERT: Five, four, three, two, one.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. You're going
5	to need to be closer. Good. Thank you. Would you
6	state and spell your full name for me?
7	MR. FOBERT: Paul W. Fobert, P-a-u-l, W.,
8	F-o-b-e-r-t.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Would
10	you raise your right hand, please?
11	* * *
12	[Witness sworn]
13	* * *
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Please
15	give us a background statement similar to that of the
16	others.
17	MR. FOBERT: About 15 years ago I bought half
18	of my father's farm. He's still farming. He's 84. I'm
19	on the Oregon Hop Commission. I've served at least two
20	terms. I'm currently the vice-chair. I would be
21	considered a small grower totally and just with hops.
22	Basically born and raised a hop grower.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And where do you
24	farm?
25	MR. FOBERT: Oh. Hubbard, Oregon, in the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	Willamette Valley. I have on our farm under the old
2	marketing order my father raised 200 acres. That's
3	basically what he had for, I don't know, 30, 40 years.
4	We did not expand any when the old order ceased, and we
5	have reacted to the market, and we have decided to
6	diversify and get into other ventures to remain
7	profitable. So we've chosen to get smaller on our farm.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And when you say
9	we, are you referring to both you and your father?
10	MR. FOBERT: Yes. Yes. My father still has
11	an interest, although I basically run the farm.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Now, when you say
13	you bought half the farm, did you buy a one-half
14	interest in the whole farm?
15	MR. FOBERT: One-half. Yes. Yes, I did.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Very
17	good. Now, you may make your statement. You have no
18	written accompaniment. Is that correct?
19	MR. FOBERT: That's correct.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. You may
21	go ahead, and if you would like Mr. Moody to ask you
22	questions, we may proceed that way, whichever you
23	prefer.
24	MR. FOBERT: I'll just make a statement.
25	* * *
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	PAUL W. FOBERT,
2	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
3	testified as follows:
4	MR. FOBERT: Basically, I wasn't categorically
5	opposed to marketing orders, but the more I hear I do
6	not want to be a handler in any way, shape, or form. I
7	do not have the money to back up one little mistake on
8	the handling end. No interest in being a handler.
9	There's a bunch of other places I do not agree with, and
10	I don't think small changes would sway my vote in any
11	way.
12	I don't believe under the current world status
13	of world market, I don't see how a marketing order
14	only in the United States could possibly all it could
15	do is transfer more acreage to Europe and less in the
16	states, the way I see it. The market share thing, I
17	don't know about everyone else, but the market share
18	means nothing to a banker. It's just a term that I
19	could care less about market share. I care about
20	profitability.
21	I don't agree with the statement, put in more
22	acres to lose less money, but that I don't agree with
23	that at all. I'm just the opposite. The action that I
24	took, we took some fields out before the '97, period,
25	and I took some more out in '98, and some in '99, and
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	I'm pretty comfortable with where we're at now, but I
2	don't want to take out any more. We're down around 100
3	acres, and I'd like to stay in the hop business. I
4	think we've done the responsible thing.
5	One other point I'd like to bring up as far as
6	the grower number issue is I've heard there's 38 grower
7	numbers in Oregon. I think there's about 25 growers, so
8	I would really hate to see any kind of a vote on this
9	marketing order based on grower numbers. And if that's
10	the way the vote is going to take place, I'm going to
11	sign up for six or eight more grower numbers.
12	So the Government people, I hope you take note
13	that if you're in charge of how the vote it taken,
14	please don't base it on grower numbers. Count actual
15	heads, entities. I just want to see this fairly no
16	hanging Chads.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Anything further,
18	Mr. Fobert, before I invite questions?
19	MR. FOBERT: Not really. I just wanted to go
20	no record and just state my opinion.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Well stated. Mr.
22	Moody.
23	MR. MOODY: Yes.
24	***
25	BY MR. MOODY:

İ	Q. You're primarily an aroma or alpha
2	grower?
3	A. About 60 percent alpha and 40 percent
4	aroma.
5	Q. And do you have contracts for the '03,
6	crop?
7	A. Yes. Not completely on the alpha side
8	but mostly. We had a good crop this year.
9	Q. All right. And is do you have any
10	plans as we sit here today to expand or reduce your
11	production in '04, and '05?
12	A. No.
13	Q. You plan to stay about the same?
14	A. I don't want to lose less money. I'm
15	going to stay the same. Yes.
16	Q. All right. And if for purposes of
17	determining the years for base, you know, the proposal
18	is '97, to '02, if the marketing order were to go into
19	effect, what year do you think that or years do you
20	think ought to be used to determine the base?
21	A. Well, I'm from the camp that says when
22	there is oversupply, you should reduce acreage. So
23	that's just one of my fundamental problems with the
24	whole marketing order. I mean, taking the highest
25	average as your base is kind of counter-productive in
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	some ways. I know you have to start somewhere. I just
2	I don't agree with that really. We did take some
3	hops out before the '97, period, so we would be affected
4	negatively that way. On my particular farm depends on
5	what saleable percentage would be set. We may or may
6	not have to acquire more base.
7	Q. Assuming the saleable were set at 60
8	percent, would you have to acquire more base?
9	A. Probably not. That's to stay at 111
10	acres. To get back up to 200 where we've been for 40
1 l	years, yes, I'd have to acquire a lot more base.
12	Q. So in year two or three or four of the
13	marketing order if you wanted to expand, you'd have to
14	go out in your view buy an extra base?
15	A. Yes, I would.
16	Q. All right. Now, for purposes of
17	determining the year of eligibility to vote in the
18	referendum, what do you think that only producers in
19	'03, should be allowed to vote if this were to go
20	forward to a referendum?
21	A. Could you clarify that? Do you mean
22	Q. Well, I mean, that's one of the questions
23	the Department has to determine, if and some
24	producers, I guess, have exited the industry at some
25	time before the '03, season. So and

1	A. I would hate to see them vote if they're
2	no longer a producer.
3	Q. So you think in order to vote you ought
4	to be a producer in '03?
5	A. I would think so.
6	Q. Okay.
7	***
8	MR. MOODY: Thank you very much.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
10	Moody. Additional questions? Any questions from the
11	Government representatives? USDA. No. Thank you so
12	much. You may step down, Mr. Fobert.
13	MR. FOBERT: Thank you.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We'll
15	change the tape at 5:17.
16	* * *
17	[Tape 5 Side 2]
18	* * *
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. We're
20	back on record at 5:18. We still have some
21	administrative things to do such as getting the exhibits
22	transferred from the court report to Ms. Dec. I would
23	now discuss with you folks whether you'd like to take
24	one more witness, that being Mr. Butsch, who did
25	indicate that he could probably make it to Yakima.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	MR. MOODY: Your Honor, we would like to,
2	given we're on kind of a roll here, I'd like to take Mr.
3	Butsch now, because it would save him at least the
4	three-hour drive up to Yakima.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And back again.
6	MR. MOODY: Yes.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. So
8	clearly you're in favor of taking his testimony. Do you
9	have any estimate as to how long it would be?
10	MR. MOODY: About ten minutes.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Does he
12	have a written statement? Wait. Come to the podium.
13	MR. MOODY: Your Honor
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Come to the podium
15	and talk to me a minute. It could be that we could be
16	taking care of the exhibits while that is being copied,
17	so it's
18	MR. BUTSCH: That's okay. I got just some
19	scratch notes.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Do you
21	think they've be useful for people trying to follow what
22	you're saying or not?
23	MR. BUTSCH: Really not.
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And do
25	you agree that your direct testimony, what you have to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	say would take only about ten minutes?
2	MR. BUTSCH: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Those
4	who are opposed to taking additional testimony before we
5	finish off with our administrative things, please raise
6	your hand.
7	All right. You may take the witness stand.
8	MR. BUTSCH: Thank you.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Before I swear you
10	in if you'll again state your full name and spell it for
11	me.
12	MR. BUTSCH: My name is Jeff Butsch. I'm an
13	Oregon hop grower. It's spelled J-e-f-f, with J for the
14	middle initial, and B-u-t-s-c-h, please.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. And now
16	if you'll raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. And
17	when you answer, you really do have to speak to the mic
18	even though you're trying to look at someone else.
19	***
20	[Witness sworn]
21	* * *
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Please
23	give us a background statement as you've heard the
24	others do.
25	MR. BUTSCH: Well, I'm an Oregon hop grower,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	and we grow most aroma hops, and I farm with my family,
2	my father, and my sister, and we've been a
3	second-generation hop farm up in O'Heron [ph], Oregon.
4	And I just have a few comments about the Hop Marketing
5	Order.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may proceed.
7	* * *
8	JEFF J. BUTSCH,
9	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
10	testified as follows:
11	MR. BUTSCH: I wasn't a grower under the old
12	marketing order, but you know, let's assume for a moment
13	I didn't have our farm is broken up. It's 50 percent
14	aroma hop with one major brewery, and the other 50
15	percent with another domestic major brewery. If we
16	didn't have those hops for a market, because I heard,
17	you know, that some of the breweries may not purchase
18	hops if this marketing, proposed marketing order goes
19	through, I'd only have about 31 acres of nuggets, and
20	they're not even all sold this year. So I'd consider
21	that a financial hardship.
22	And so to me Anheuser-Busch and the other
23	domestic breweries that buy aroma hops add quite a bit
24	of stability, and that's what I need as a grower. I
25	grow a premium type of hop, and they try to take care of

1	their growers, and that's why we're in business. It's a
2	big responsibility to market hops. We try to do that as
3	a family, and so in my closing we want to emphasize that
4	for us we strongly are opposed to this marketing order
5	as it is set up.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: When you say it's a
7	big responsibility to market hops, and that's what you
8	do as a family
9	MR. BUTSCH: Uh-huh.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:are you
11	suggesting that you believe you'll get a better result
12	by doing it that way rather than having it be done in
13	committee?
14	MR. BUTSCH: Yes. We grow other crops, and we
15	believe in the free enterprise system, and we seem to
16	have survived for the two generations that I was talking
17	about. And that's how we, you know, we survive. So I
18	don't see any problem with it. I haven't had to let,
19	you know, eight individuals on a board market our crops
20	since my grandfather let us use the land to farm.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
22	Butsch. Mr. Moody, follow-up questions?
23	***
24	BY MR. MOODY:
25	Q. Do you have if this were to go to a
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	referendum, do you have an opinion as to whether only
2	the '03, producers should be allowed to vote in that
3	referendum?
4	A. Yes. I think the '03, would be the only
5	year that I would if I had to say today were allowed
6	to vote, because I know that in 1997, we took a 53
7	percent cut, and a lot of my neighbors took a cut as
8	well. So I don't see where take these six years like
9	the HMO people are suggesting. I think that's a disfair
10	advantage.
11	Q. All right. And for purposes of
12	calculating base, do you think everybody ought to be
13	if the order were to go into effect, that everybody
14	ought to just get their production '03, as their base?
15	A. Yes.
16	* * *
17	MR. MOODY: All right. Thanks very much.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Other questions?
19	Mr. Monahan.
20	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
21	***
22	BY MR. MONAHAN:
23	Q. Sir, one of your concerns in you heard
24	obviously the testimony that because the marketing
25	order, the because the proposed marketing order, the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Anheuser-Busch Company is perhaps not going to enter
2	more contracts?
3	A. Yes, I did.
4	Q. That's a concern to you?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Is that one of the reasons you're
7	opposing the order?
8	A. Yes.
9	* * *
10	MR. MONAHAN: That's all I have, Your Honor.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
12	Monahan. Representatives of USDA. Dr. Hinman.
13	* * *
14	BY DR. HINMAN:
15	Q. Yes. Mr. Butsch, I just want to ask the
16	same question I asked the previous core of witnesses
17	about the small versus large. You heard the previous
18	definition, above and below \$750,000
19	A. Uh-huh.
20	Qtotal sales of hops and of total
21	crops.
22	A. Uh-huh.
23	Q. Can you characterize your farm in that
24	regard?
25	A. Well, your question's alluding to just
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	hops or
2	Q. Well
3	Athe whole farm?
4	Qfirst of all, do you have if you're
5	willing to say, more or less than \$750,000 in hop sales
6	in a recent or typical year. And then total farm sales.
7	A. Well, we'd fit into that small grower
8	category, under 500,000 for hops, but we grow other
9	crops like I had mentioned.
10	Q. Okay.
11	A. So you want to know what else
12	Q. Just the total with the other crops
13	you're over 750,000
14	A. Right. That's correct.
15	***
16	DR. HINMAN: Okay. That's all. Thank you
17	very much.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Dr.
19	Hinman. Ms. Finn.
20	* * *
21	BY MS. FINN:
22	Q. Hello. Excuse me. What is the process
23	for getting a grower number in Oregon?
24	A. I believe that the other speakers ahead
25	of me today for the Oregon Hop Commission said that
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	there was an issue through the Oregon Hop Commission.
2	They issue the numbers.
3	Q. Do you have to verify in any way that you
4	are a grower?
5	A. I think it's similar to the evidence is
6	in the production of the hops themselves, and they can't
7	track the hops unless there's a grower number, a variety
8	number, and a lot. Is that what you were asking?
9	Q. Yes. How many growers would you say are
10	in Oregon?
11	A. I think somebody I believe there's
12	about 38. Maybe there's less. I'm not sure.
13	Q. Did you hear the other gentleman say he
14	thinks there's only 25?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Do you think it's more like 38?
17	A. Probably it's more like 25, because most
18	of the time we have a pretty full meeting at the
19	commission meetings, because I attend all those, and I'd
20	say on a head count basis it's more like 25.
21	* * *
22	MS. FINN: All right. Thank you.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Other questions for
24	Mr. Butsch? There are none. Thank you. You may step
25	down.

i	MR. ROY: Your Honor.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh. Mr. Roy.
3	MR. ROY: I'm sorry.
4	***
5	BY MR. ROY:
6	Q. Mr. Butsch, if there was ample base
7	available free of charge, let's say, would that change
8	anything? Would that the impact would be very
9	minimal to you?
10	A. Yes. Probably so.
11	***
12	MR. ROY: Okay. Thanks.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. You may
14	step down. All right. Is there any further evidence to
15	present today? There is none. I'd like now to handle
16	the transfer of the exhibits from the court reporter to
17	Ms. Dec.
18	MR. MCNAHAN: Your Honor, if I may. Brendan
19	Monahan for the Proponent's Committee. The Proponents
20	have obviously no more evidence or testimony to submit
21	today. As I gather may be the norm in these types of
22	proceedings, some important caucuses in the hallways
23	have resulted in some proposed amendments to the
24	verbiage in the order itself, specifically comments from
25	persons assembled regarding modification of the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	definition of handler and what constitutes handling. Is
2	that something that, Your Honor, the Department would
3	like us to bring up on Monday, or I could even read them
4	right now.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I think you should
6	to give everybody a heads up so they can think about it,
7	and then I'll have you do it again
8	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:Monday.
10	MR. MONAHAN: Okay. For further, purposes of
11	further clarification and to give a better idea of the
12	intent of the Proponent's Committee, the term, handling,
13	is intended to include delivery on contract for sale,
14	delivery on consignment, and conversion from raw hops to
15	processed form.
16	And if I realize this is late in the day
17	and probably brings up a whole host of questions, and
18	what we would be happy to do is present a witness first
19	thing Monday to address these provisions.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I'm
21	very glad you did bring that up now. Thank you.
22	MR. MONAHAN: You're welcome.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Anyone ask for any
24	clarification on that? Would you repeat it, Mr.
25	Monahan? Now, Mr. Monahan, I'm looking at the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	definitions, and I presume this would go into Section
2	991.08, which says handle, it's the definition of
3	handle.
4	MR. MONAHAN: That's correct, Your Honor.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
6	MR. MONAHAN: One moment. I'm going to let
7	Mr. Carpenter reiterate these just in case there is a
8	follow-up question.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
10	MR. ROY: Okay.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: It turns out it
12	will be Mr. Roy rather than Mr. Carpenter. Mr. Roy,
13	you're not a witness at this point. Is that correct? I
14	better swear you in in case there are questions.
15	MR. ROY: Okay.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: State your full
17	name for me.
18	MR. ROY: Leslie Alan Roy, L-e-s-l-i-e,
19	A-l-a-n, and then R-o-y.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Would
21	you raise your right hand, please.
22	***
23	[Witness sworn]
24	***
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	***
2	LESLIE A. ROY,
3	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
4	testified as follows:
5	MR. ROY: If you could indulge me for a minute
6	as I get the correct make sure. I want to make sure
7	this is inserted in the proper place.
8	Okay. Under Section 991.08, handle. Okay.
9	Currently it says, "Handle means to prepare hops for
10	market, acquire hops from a producer, use hops
11	commercially at one's own production, sell, transport,
12	or ship, accept as common on contract carrier of hops
13	owned." We would like to also insert into that, to
14	handle also means to convert from raw hops
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Wait, wait, wait,
16	wait. After the word owned
17	MR. ROY: Okay.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:does it say by
19	another and then close parentheses?
20	MR. ROY: Okay. After okay. Acquire hops
21	from a producer, insert conversion or conversion from
22	raw hops to processed form, use hops commercially.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Could you I know
24	you have to do this on the fly but
25	MR. ROY: Yeah.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:could you read
2	the whole section as you now propose it?
3	MR. ROY: Okay. Section 991.08, handle.
4	"Handle means to prepare hops for market, acquire hops
5	from a producer, convert from raw hops to processed
6	form, use hops commercially at one's own production,
7	sell, transport, or ship, accept as common or contract
8	carrier of hops owned." I could go on to the rest of it
9	but
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. By another,
11	end parentheses.
12	MR. ROY: You know, yes. You know, if I may
13	indulge the Court here, I think it would probably be
14	more appropriate, I didn't see the second page here, and
15	I apologize. It was handed to me very quickly. I would
16	insert put this, convert from raw hops to processed
17	form, as D, Sub-Section D on that last page. I
18	apologize.
19	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, maybe what the
20	Proponents want to do is come in on Monday with
21	something typed out with how the language they wanted,
22	because that way I think would help them and us to see
23	it rather than to try to insert things.
24	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, this is Brendan
25	Monahan. That was our intent. I just wanted to not
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	blindside everybody on Monday and try to give notice of
2	the three items. And I'd be happy to read them again so
3	that your notes are accurate.
4	The three revisions, and Your Honor, at this
5	point in time I don't think we're prepared to make
6	line-by-line verbiage amendments, but the three concepts
7	that we need to include in the amended definition would
8	be that the handling includes delivery on contract for
9	sale, delivery on consignment, and conversion from raw
10	hops to processed form. Those three things would
11	constitute handling, Your Honor, and we'd be happy to
12	submit a revised Section 991.08.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And what you mean
14	by processed form would not include baling, but it would
15	include pelletizing?
16	MR. MONAHAN: Yes, Your Honor.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Is that the idea?
18	Okay.
19	MR. MONAHAN: Pellets, extract, you name it.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I would
21	this is not, again, an evidentiary matter, but this
22	is one of the things that the Proponent's Committee
23	envisioned through the process of these hearings was a
24	process of, you know, good faith communication and give
25	and take. These proposals are the result of helpful
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1 comments that were made by members of the industry who 2 apparently either did not have the opportunity or just unable to contribute to the process as it was being 3 developed. And I know that the people left in this 4 5 room, including the lawyers, know how to get ahold of us over the weekend. I would encourage any member in the 6 7 audience to grab ahold of a member of the committee with 8 any recommendations, and Mr. Moody, Mr. Carswell, I'd be 9 happy to chat with you if you had any ideas about change 10 to verbiage that would clear things up or make things 11 more workable. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. 12 13 Mr. Carswell. you. 14 MR. CARSWELL: I just wanted to comment on 15 this, if it's okay, because Brendan earlier indicated 16

MR. CARSWELL: I just wanted to comment on this, if it's okay, because Brendan earlier indicated that, you know, some frustration about the time that's been spent on cross examination. But I think a lot of that time has been spent in terms of valid issues being raised with respect to the drafting of the proposals. And you know, I appreciate, Brendan, that you welcome our input, but you know, as the party who's opposed to the order, I, you know, I frankly have no interest on, you know, don't mean to be rude, but I have no interest in fixing the flaws that are in the order, and I think that if the order had been drafted in the proper way, York Stenographic Services, Inc.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	chere wouldn't have been a for of the time that has been			
2	necessary to point those issues out that we're kind of			
3	being charged with.			
4	And I just wanted to make that comment. I			
5	hope it's appropriate.			
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.			
7	Carswell. You need not respond, Mr. Monahan.			
8	MR. MONAHAN: I was just going to say that I			
9	won't expect a phone call.			
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I'd			
11	like to the court reporter to gather up the record copy			
12	of the exhibits and to hand those to Ms. Dec, and then			
13	I'm going to see if what she's got agrees with my list			
14	of what's been admitted.			
15	The first ten that I show as having been			
16	admitted are 1 through 10.			
17	MS. DEC: I have 1 through 10.			
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And the			
19	next one I show as being admitted is 16, which is a			
20	Dasell [ph] chart. What are you thumbing through there			
21	Do you have 11, 12, 13, 14?			
22	MS. DEC: Yes, I do.			
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I think those were			
24	provided, but we've not yet dealt with them. So it			
25	doesn't hurt if you have extras.			
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.			
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077			

1	MS. DEC: Okay.		
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay.		
3	MS. DEC: I'm with you.		
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Now I think you		
5	should have 16 through 24 admitted.		
6	MS. DEC: I do not have 24. I believe that		
7	was the statement that was marked that Mr. Annen gave.		
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Kerr.		
9	MS. DEC: I have that as Exhibit 25.		
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh. You're right		
11	Let's see. What you have 25 there?		
12	MS. DEC: Yes, ma'am.		
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. And that's		
14	the Kerr statement?		
15	MS. DEC: Yes.		
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay.		
17	MS. RAZICK: Your Honor, if I may interrupt.		
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes.		
19	MS. RAZICK: You admitted Exhibit 24 right		
20	after Andrew Kerr's testimony was over, but it's been		
21	marked as Government's Exhibit 25.		
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh. Thank you.		
23	MS. RAZICK: So we did admit 24, thinking it		
24	was 25.		
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Is		
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.		
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077		

l	there any objection to the admission into evidence of			
2	Exhibit 25? There being none, Exhibit 25 is hereby			
3	admitted.			
4	Now, do you have any copy of 24?			
5	MS. DEC: Yes, I do.			
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. Very good.			
7	And so what I admitted into evidence was 24, even though			
8	I was I meant to work on 25. Now they're both in.			
9	All right. Good.			
10	Is there anything further before we adjourn?			
11	It's 5:42, and I'll see you in Yakima, Washington at			
12	8:30 in the morning Monday. Thank you.			

1					
2	CERTIFICATE	OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER AND PROOFREADER			
3					
5	IN RE:	HOPS PRODUCED IN WASHINGTON, OREGON,			
6 7		IDAHO, AND CALIFORNIA			
8 9	HELD AT:	PORTLAND, OREGON			
10 11	DATE:	OCTOBER 17, 2003			
12	We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the				
13	foregoing pages, numbered 530 through 824, inclusive,				
14	are the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared				
15	from the reporting by the reporter in attendance at the				
16	above identified hearing, in accordance with applicable				
17	provisions of the current USDA contract, and have				
18 19	verified the accuracy of the transcript by (1) comparing				
20	the typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearings, and (2)				
21	comparing the final proofed typewritten transcript				
22	against the reporting or recording accomplished at the				
23	hearing.	apoliting of footiating accomplished at the			
24					
25	Date:	\sim \sim			
26		, declaughertil			
27		Ann Daugherty, Transcriber			
28		York Stenographic' Services, Inc.			
29		.			
30	Date:	Charle M. V.			
31		Jusan Hours			
32		Sarah Mowrer, Proofreader			
33		York Stenographic Services, Inc.			
34	Data	M. P			
35 36	Date:	Attack Fred lone			
37		Mark Frethem, Reporter			
38		York Stenographic Services, Inc.			
		totic occupyraphite betytees, inc.			